

L'AFFAIRE WILLIAMSON

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND HOLOCAUST DENIAL



E. MICHAEL JONES

L'AFFAIRE WILLIAMSON

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND HOLOCAUST DENIAL



E. MICHAEL JONES

L'affaire Williamson:
The Catholic Church and Holocaust Denial
By E. Michael Jones

Fidelity Press
206 Marquette Avenue
South Bend, Indiana 46617

© all rights reserved

To my children

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[Preface](#)

[Chapter One: Bishop Williamson](#)

[The Brunt](#)

[An Apology](#)

[The Right Questions](#)

[Personal Narrative](#)

[Thought Experiment](#)

[Conspiracy Nut](#)

[Administrative Decision](#)

[*Non datur tertius*](#)

[Chapter Two: Holocaust Denial and Thought Control and Deborah](#)

[Lipstadt](#)

[Bigger Issue](#)

[Hired to Get Money](#)

[Chapter Three: Bishop Williamson at the End of His Tether](#)

[The Priest Crisis in Ireland](#)

[The Church and Her Enemies](#)

[Maynooth, Ireland, June 19, 2010](#)

[The Maynooth Conference](#)

[GIFT and *Dignitas Personae* #12](#)

[New Light](#)

[Back and Forth](#)

[The Only Thing](#)

[Biographical Note](#)

Preface

On Thursday, January 22, 2009, within minutes of the leaking on the internet of the announcement that the excommunications of the four Society of St. Pius X bishops were to be lifted, reports that Bishop Richard Williamson was a "Holocaust denier" began circulating on the web as well. These reports referred to an interview conducted months before in Germany but to be broadcast the following day on Swedish TV.

In spite of the Vatican's efforts to the contrary, news reports kept confusing the Catholic Church's focus on the sin of schism with the media world's focus on the unforgivable secular sin, *i.e.*, "Holocaust denial" and anti-Semitism.

Holocaust denial is another word for Jewish control of discourse, in particular historical discourse, in particular historical discourse about World War II. If a historian publishes something that a powerful Jew, which is to say a Jew with powerful backers, dislikes, that person will be punished. If the person in question lives by writing books, as David Irving once did, the Lipstadt brigade will get him blacklisted in the publishing industry. If the person in question is a professor, the big Jews will try to get him fired, as Deborah Lipstadt herself did in the case of Professor David O'Connell. In that instance, Lipstadt failed, but David O'Connell's case is not typical in this regard.

More typical is the case of Norman Finkelstein, who was fired from his job at DePaul University in Chicago. The fact that Finkelstein was a Jew himself doesn't matter. It's the big Jews, in this case Alan Dershowitz, who decide who is to live and who is to die in academe and publishing. Finkelstein wrote a devastating critique of Dershowitz's book *The Case for Israel*, and, as a result, Dershowitz set out to destroy Finkelstein's career.

E. Michael Jones

January 2012

Chapter One: Bishop Williamson

"Christianity clears up the mystery which hangs over Judaism, accounting fully for the punishment of the people by specifying their sin, their heinous sin. If, instead of hailing their own Messiah, they crucified Him, then the strange scourge which has pursued them after the deed, and the energetic wording of the curse before it, are explained by the very strangeness of their guilt; - or rather, their sin is their punishment; for in rejecting their Divine King, they ipso facto lost their living principle and their nationality."

John Henry Cardinal Newman

An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent

"Oh, you're German. I'm sorry. I thought there was something wrong with you."

Basil Fawlty

Fawlty Towers

"Well, the police may come for Richard Williamson and hand him over for deportation proceedings."

Thomas W. Case, "The Society of Pius X Gets Sick," *Fidelity*, October 1992

On Wednesday, January 21, 2009, in the middle of the week which the Church has traditionally used to promote Christian unity, Pope Benedict XVI signed a letter announcing that he intended to lift the excommunications imposed on the bishops in charge of the Society of St. Pius X, taking a major step toward ending the almost 21-year old schism that began on June 30, 1988 when Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, along with Bishop Antonio Castro de Mayer, illicitly consecrated Bernard Fellay, Bernard Tissier de Mallerais, Alfonso de Galaretta, and Richard Williamson in a ceremony at the SSPX seminary in Ecône, Switzerland. On July 1, 1988, one day after the illicit consecrations, Cardinal Bernardin Gantin, the then head of the Congregation of Bishops in Rome, announced that all six men had incurred excommunication *latae sententiae*, the penalty laid down in the revised Code of Canon Law, Canon 1382, for directly participating in an episcopal consecration in the absence of a papal mandate.

According to the January 21, 2009 document, Bishop Fellay, the

Superior General of the Society had written in December to Cardinal Dario Castrillon-Hoyos, Prefect of the Ecclesia Dei commission, requesting the removal of the excommunications. Fellay claimed that, "We are always firmly determined in our will to remain Catholic and to place all our efforts at the service of the Church of Our Lord Jesus Christ, which is the Roman Catholic Church. We accept its teachings with filial animus. We believe firmly in the Primacy of Peter and its prerogatives, and for this the current situation makes us suffer so much."

Pope Benedict decided to lift the excommunications in order to promote unity in the Church: "This gift of peace at the end of the Christmas celebrations, is also intended to be a sign to promote unity in the charity of the universal Church and to try to vanquish the scandal of division." ("With peace like this," we can imagine the pope muttering to himself a few days later, "who needs war?")

Serious efforts to end the Lefebvre schism began in April 2005, when Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger became pope. Cardinal Ratzinger had always been sympathetic to widespread use of the old Mass, a cause dear to traditionalists. Two years into his pontificate Benedict lifted all remaining restrictions on the celebration of the *Vetus Ordo*, when he issued the *motu proprio Summorum Pontificum* on July 7, 2007.

Bishop Fellay met with Pope Benedict at Castel Gandolfo on August 29, 2005, only four months after Benedict's election, and from that moment discussions started in earnest for the removal of the excommunications. On June 4, 2008, Cardinal Castrillon-Hoyos set several conditions to be met by the SSPX to facilitate a lifting of the excommunications. All of them had to do with schism, which is based on lack of charity; none of them had anything remotely to do with the Holocaust.

In November 2008 Bishop Fellay led a pilgrimage to Lourdes, during which he asked the faithful to pray the rosary to have the excommunications lifted. On January 21, 2009 his prayers were answered when he received the letter from Giovanni Battista Re remitting the excommunications. Re mentioned in his letter that the gesture was intended "to be a sign to promote unity in the charity of the universal Church and to try to end the scandal of division." Re also mentioned the hope that this gesture would "be followed by the prompt accomplishment of full communion with the Church of the entire Society of St. Pius X, thus testifying true fidelity and true recognition of the Magisterium and of the authority of the Pope with the proof of visible

unity."

Bishop Fellay responded by expressing his "filial gratitude to the Holy Father for this gesture," which he hoped would help "to remedy the unprecedented crisis which presently shakes the Catholic world, and which Pope John Paul II had designated as a state of 'silent apostasy.'" The message of the pope's gesture was clear to Fellay: "Tradition will no longer be stigmatized."

"Thanks to this gesture," Fellay continued, "Catholics attached to Tradition throughout the world will no longer be unjustly stigmatized and condemned for having kept the Faith of their fathers. Catholic tradition is no longer excommunicated. Though it never was in itself, it was often excommunicated and cruelly so in day to day events." In his response, Fellay stressed his and the SSPX's loyalty, as well as a willingness to work toward resolving:

the unprecedented crisis which is shaking the Church today: crisis of vocations, crisis of religious practice, of catechism, of the reception of the sacraments . . . Before us Paul VI went so far as to say that "from some fissure the smoke of Satan had entered the Church," and he spoke of the "self-destruction of the Church." John Paul II did not hesitate to say that Catholicism in Europe was, as it were, in a state of "silent apostasy." Shortly before his election to the Throne of Peter, B XVI compared the Church to a "boat taking water on every side." We are ready to write the Creed with our own blood, to sign the anti-modernist oath, the profession of faith of Pius IV, we accept and make our own all the councils up to the Second Vatican Council about which we express some reservations.

Some pundits, however, felt there was a contradiction between the two assertions, *i.e.*, between professions of loyalty and recognition that an "unprecedented crisis is shaking the Church today." Neoconservative George Weigel was one of those pundits. Weigel took issue with Fellay's reservations about Vatican II, claiming that "Responsible canon lawyers have raised questions about whether this arrogance [reservations about Vatican II] on the part of Bishop Fellay does not cast in question his fulfillment of the canonical requirements for a lawful lifting of his excommunication." (George Weigel, *Newsweek*, "Rome's Reconciliation: Did the pope heal or deepen the Lefebvre schism? www.newsweek.com/id/181721/).

Weigel puts in words a spectre which would go on to haunt the entire discussion surrounding the lifting of the excommunications, namely, the fact that in some circles of the Church the profession of faith had been replaced by a profession of faith in Vatican II. Vatican II was not just one council among many, according to this view. At some point during the past 50 years it had become a shibboleth and the sine qua non of church membership. Once it had been proposed as the substitute for the Creed, Vatican II then got reduced to the documents which were supposed to support the political agenda of the person doing the reducing. In the case of American neocons like Weigel, the Catholic Faith, became by way of synecdoche, Vatican II statements on the Jews and religious liberty. If Bishop Fellay expressed reservations about Vatican II, this was an indication in Weigel's mind "that the healing has not taken place. . . . Moreover, Fellay's letter raises the stakes for everyone, and to the highest level. For what is at issue now, is the integrity of the Church's self-understanding, which must include the authenticity of the teaching of Vatican II." Weigel found it difficult "to see how the unity of the Catholic Church will be advanced if the Lefebvrist faction does not publicly and unambiguously affirm Vatican Council II's teaching on the nature of the church, on religious freedom, and on the sin of anti-Semitism."

"How," Weigel wondered in a comment to *The Washington Post*, "does this advance the unity of the church if they are reconciled [without embracing church positions on religious freedom and anti-Semitism?] This really has the possibility of unraveling a lot of the accomplishments of the John Paul and Benedict periods if not handled well." All of the themes were introduced in the overture of this opera, which would revolve around but not resolve the related issues of tradition and anti-Semitism. Was anti-Semitism part of the Catholic DNA? Did Vatican II trump the Gospel of St. John? Or did it have to be read in the light of the Gospels?

On Thursday, January 22, within minutes of the leaking on the internet of the announcement that the excommunications of the four bishops were to be lifted, reports that Bishop Williamson was a "Holocaust denier" began circulating on the web as well. These reports referred to an interview conducted months before in Germany but to be broadcast the following day on Swedish TV.

In his interview, Williamson did not deny the suffering of the Jewish people at the hands of the Nazi regime, but he did question the details of the

Holocaust narrative, concerning the numbers of people who died at Auschwitz and how they died. In doing this he broke the law in Germany and earned himself the epithet "Holocaust denier."

"Pope Rehabilitates Holocaust Denier" is the headline Reuters used to frame the issue. Once the issue got framed that way, the intent of the story became clear. *L'affaire Williamson* was born as a combination of the Danish cartoon story and the media-orchestrated uproar among Muslims over the pope's Regensburg speech. The "Pope Rehabilitates Holocaust Denier" incident was a replay of the media-inspired frenzy, which took place in the wake of the pope's September 2006 Regensburg speech, over the pope's quote from Emperor Manuel Paleologos. Once the term "Holocaust denier" got broached, the story took on a life of its own, and that life had nothing to do with the pope's intention, namely, to heal a schism and promote unity. In fact, before long it became clear that the point of this story was to prevent the schism from being healed by proposing a counter-morality based on a counter-magisterium based on the dogmas of political correctness.

In spite of the Vatican's efforts to the contrary, news reports kept confusing the church's focus on the sin of schism with the media world's focus on the unforgivable secular sin, *i.e.*, "Holocaust denial" and anti-Semitism. The media could be forgiven for their ignorance in light of the fact that theologians were failing to make the appropriate distinctions too. Wolfgang Beinert, a student of the pope who now occupies the same chair the pope held at the University of Regensburg, faulted his former mentor for breaking what he termed a 2000-year old tradition in the Church. Up until a week ago, Ratzinger's successor at Regensburg opined, "Groups which stood in contradiction to the pope had to recant their positions before they were readmitted to the church." Beinert here seems to be referring to the "sin" of Holocaust denial rather than the sin of schism because, he "doubts that Rome was unaware of Williamson's views." Beinert was evidently unaware that the bishops had signed a statement repudiating schism. Either that, or he considered holocaust denial a greater sin. If Catholics were confused it was understandable. Evidently even theologians were having a hard time keeping their sins straight.

The Swedish TV interview had been in the can for months but it got released within minutes of the announcement that the pope intended to lift the excommunications. Sources close to the SSPX in Sweden had been warning them during the fall of 2008 that they were being set up by the TV journalist

Ali Fegan and the people associated with the Swedish National TV show "*Uppdrag granskning*" ("Mission Examination"). The SSPX's Father Morgan, however, continued cooperating evidently feeling that Swedish National Television was interested in filming the ordination of the Swedish SSPX seminarian Sten Sandmarks at the SSPX seminary in Zaitzkofen, Bavaria, which is where Bishop Williamson was interviewed on November 1, 2008 when he made his comments about how many people died in Auschwitz. Evidence that Williamson trusted the Swedish film crew is evident on the film itself when Williamson says, naively, "You realize you can get me in prison for that. I hope that is not your intention."

Once Fegan and the "*Uppdrag granskning*" crew had Williamson's interview in the can they traveled around Sweden showing it to the various groups which rented their facilities to the SSPX claiming that if they continued to rent their facilities to the SSPX they would be indicted as Holocaust deniers as well. The Anglican Church in Stockholm succumbed to these pressures and canceled their contract with the SSPX.

Not content to leave it at that, the "*Uppdrag granskning*" crew then showed the Williamson film clip to other SSPX clergymen, putting them in the unenviable situation of either denouncing Bishop Williamson in public or incriminating themselves in the crime of "Holocaust denial." According to the same source which tried to warn the SSPX in the fall of 2008, holocaust denial is "here in Sweden the worst sin and crime you can possibly commit, according to the gramscian-leftist Jewish-owned Swedish media establishment." The word of the set up had gone out through the SSPX by late November or early December. We know this because the same source wrote that "I hope and pray that this TV-program will not be broadcasted [sic] before Christmas-then we would have some time to prepare ourselves [sic] for this fight."

Italian journalists writing for *Il Reformista* and *Il Giornale* were claiming that the Williamson affair was the result of a conspiracy between Ali Fegan and the Swedish national TV network and the French journalist and Lesbian activist Fiametta Venner who had written a book, *Les Nouveaux Soldats du pape*, attacking the SSPX in France and an unnamed official in the Vatican, with good contacts in Scandinavia, who wanted to thwart the reunion. The bishop of Sweden, Anders Arborelius, OCD, was no friend of the SSPX in Sweden and clearly upset by the SSPX's campaign to reconvert Sweden back to the Catholic faith. Arborelius spoke of inclusivity as the

chief characteristic of Catholicism, something clearly at odds with racism and intolerance, which he seemed to imply was motivating the SSPX in its attempts to convert the Swedes. By the end of the first week of the controversy, Vatican Spokesman Federico Lombardi was one of the few people who still claimed that the timing of the reversal of Williamson's excommunication and the Swedish broadcast were "absolutely unrelated."

The folks at "*Uppdrag granskning*," however, had bigger fish to fry than disrupting the SSPX's Christmas holiday or defending Swedes from proselytism. The fact that the interview showed up on the internet within minutes of the announcement lifting the excommunications showed that the timing was intended to disrupt the healing of the Lefebvre schism, something that became obvious when the Anti-Defamation League got involved in the story.

On January 23, one day before the announcement was officially promulgated, the ADL issued a press release whose intent, to thwart the lifting of the excommunications, was clear from their headline: "ADL to Vatican: Do Not Rehabilitate Holocaust Denier Bishop." When the first ADL press release failed to derail the lifting of the excommunications, the ADL followed up one day later with another press release: "ADL disappointed in Pope's Decision to Rehabilitate Holocaust Denier Bishop." In the second ADL press release on the Williamson incident, Foxman claimed that Benedict's decision to lift the excommunications "undermines the strong relationship between Catholics and Jews that flourished under Pope John Paul II and which Benedict said he would continue when he came into his papacy." Foxman then mentioned Vatican II and "the centuries-long history of anti-Semitism in the Church," which Vatican II was supposed to redress, claiming that Pope Benedict's action was "a most troubling setback."

If anyone had any doubts about the purpose behind the ADL press releases, Charlotte Knoblauch, president of the German Council of Jews, laid them to rest when she told the *Rheinische Post* in Germany, "I would like an outcry in the church against such actions from the pope."

Der Spiegel, Germany's socialist weekly, then began orchestrating that outcry, putting the pope on the cover of the next week's issue along with the claim that the "German pope had embarrassed the Church." In the January 26, 2009 issue of *Spiegel Online International*, Rabbi David Rosen, head of the American Jewish Committee, was quoted as saying, "In welcoming an open Holocaust denier into the Catholic Church without any recantation on his

part, the Vatican has made a mockery of John Paul II's moving and impressive repudiation and condemnation of anti-Semitism." The vice president of the Central Council of Jews, Dieter Graumann, accused the pope of an "incomprehensible act of provocation. The fact that it is of all things a German pope who conjured up this new ice age between Jews and the Catholic Church . . . that is something particularly painful, astonishing, and deplorable."

Germany's newspapers then followed the lead set by the world's major Jewish organizations, which is to say, they condemned the pope's actions via appeals to Vatican II and invidious comparisons between Benedict and his predecessor, as when the Frankfurter *Allgemeine Zeitung* wrote: "it remains a mystery why the pope is now making such concessions to the fanatical opponents of the Second Vatican Council, that he is making a mockery of his predecessor John Paul II's insistence on obedience to the teachings of the church and to the pope."

Two weeks after the pope signed the letter lifting the excommunications, *Der Spiegel* was still on his case, this time for appointing Gerhard Maria Wagner as auxiliary bishop in Linz. Wagner had earned the ire of *Spiegel* because he has "a knack for inappropriate comments," including "claiming in 2005 in a parish newsletter" that "Hurricane Katrina was an act of 'divine retribution' for New Orleans' permissive ways." Wagner had similarly inappropriate views about Harry Potter books and the tsunami in Thailand. Taken altogether these views rendered Wagner unacceptable as a bishop, according to *Der Spiegel*.

All of this raises the question: why does *Spiegel* have a dog in this fight? Who gave a socialist magazine in Germany veto rights over who the pope appoints as auxiliary bishop in Linz? Does this mean the Church has veto rights the next time a *Spiegel* sympathizer like Guenther Grass gets nominated for a Nobel Prize?

Before long, anyone who had an agenda and was willing to dump on the pope got a hearing in the German press. On a normal news day at *Der Spiegel*, Hans Kueng was treated with dismissive condescension if not contempt. Years ago, *Spiegel* reported on a phone call Kueng received after Pope John Paul I died. A Vatican official was on the other end of the line wondering if Kueng would like to become pope. After considering the proposition for a moment Kueng declined the honor, explaining "If I were pope, I'd no longer be infallible."

But that was then. Now *Der Spiegel* was rehabilitating Kueng Germany's great prophet, and Kueng responded by producing what had to be the most moronic piece of journalism generated by the entire Williamson affair, namely, "If Obama were Pope." "It is no coincidence that the Pope celebrated his 81st birthday in the White House," Kueng hinted darkly. "Both Bush and Ratzinger are unteachable in matters of birth control and abortion, disinclined to implement any serious reforms, arrogant and without transparency in the way in which they exercise their office, restricting freedoms and human rights." By lifting the schism, Pope Benedict "has confirmed all the fears which arose when he was elected pope." Before long, Kueng's agenda came to the fore: "What would a Pope do who acted in the spirit of Obama?" Well, he would do what Hans Kueng has been complaining about for decades now, namely, "he could authorize contraception over night, permit the marriage of priests, make possible the ordination of women and allow eucharistic fellowship with Protestant churches." What all this had to do with Holocaust denial or schism wasn't immediately clear. What was clear, though, was Spiegel's attempt to mobilize Hans Kueng's German fifth column as a way of weakening the pope's authority. The veiled threat was becoming clearer with each intemperate outburst: admit the SSPX and the German Left will leave the Church.

Reaction from Germany was vehement to the point of hysteria. It was as if the fact that the pope was German somehow obliged them to be anti-Catholic in the same way that the Holocaust obliged them to be anti-German. Beyond that, there was the undeniable fact that Germany had criminalized the thought crime of Holocaust denial in 1994. If the pope failed to condemn "Holocaust denial," it put German Catholics in legal jeopardy, but did Germany have a jail big enough for 20 million Catholics? That seemed a bit far-fetched. But the thought of revocation of the "*Kirchensteuer*," the tax money the German government paid to the Church, was enough to send shivers down the spines of theologians and bishops. Hence, the uproar. Walter Cardinal Kasper tried to play the whole thing down, attributing the biggest church-state crisis in Germany since the Reformation to "management errors." But the theologians were having none of this.

Hermann Haering, a liberal German Catholic theologian, said that the Pope should resign "for the good of the Church." Werner Thissen, bishop of Hamburg, claimed that the lifting of the excommunications had led to "a loss of confidence in the pope." Christoph Schoenborn, bishop of Vienna, came

close to claiming that Bishop Williamson had committed the unforgivable sin, when he opined that "he who denies the Holocaust cannot be rehabilitated within the Church." Gerhard Ludwig Mueller, the bishop in Pope Benedict's home city of Regensburg, outdid Schoenborn in fraternal charity by announcing that Williamson would not be welcome in its churches.

The lack of support that the pope had among his fellow German bishops became even more apparent when their spokesman Matthias Kopp appeared on German television. Matthias Kopp claimed that because Pope John Paul II signed a concordat with Israel in 1993 (an agreement, by the way, which Israel has yet to honor) the Church has obligated itself to "fight every form of anti-Semitism." Kopp, however, failed to define even one form of anti-Semitism, thereby playing into the hands of organizations like the ADL. "Every form of anti-Semitism" (*jede Form des Antisemitismus*) long ago became another word for Jewish hegemony over the Church because the operative definition of anti-Semitism invariably ends up be the definition promoted by groups like the ADL and Abe Foxman. This means that the Church must adopt Jewish categories in its internal governance, which in turn means that schism takes a back seat to "Holocaust denial" when it comes to defining the gravity of the sin.

Kopp pressed further into the theological equivalent of terra incognita when he asserted that the Church had to censure Bishop Williamson, because combating "every form of anti-Semitism" now "belongs to the Magisterium of the Church" ("*Das sind Elemente, die zur Lehre der Kirche dazugehoeren*"). The press secretary of the German Bishops' Conference claimed that the Holocaust was now part of Catholic dogma. Taking his cue on Church teaching from a law which was passed in Germany in 1994, Kopp concludes that "the Holocaust cannot be denied." The reasoning goes as follows: "The Holocaust is not denied by the Church. Therefore, a bishop who has returned to the Church after 20 years of schism cannot deny the holocaust. . . . He must conform to the teaching of the Church" ("*Also hat er sich der Lehre der Kirche anzupassen.*") (Kreuz.net Monday, January 26, 2009). The fact that Kopp lives in a country which has outlawed historical research on certain topics does not change the fact that the Church can pronounce infallibly on matters of faith and morals but has no mandate whatsoever to pass judgments on historical matters like how many people died in concentration camps and how they died, the matters which Bishop

Williamson brought up in his interview. In matters where she cannot speak authoritatively, the Church allows the faithful to form their own opinions, everywhere it seems but in Germany.

Spiegel accused the Vatican of having an "an apparent tin ear" (a phrase which probably lost something in the translation) on matters dealing with the Jews, homosexuals, women, etc. etc., and as an example of this "tin ear" mentioned "moves to have the war-time Pope Pius XII, who is accused by some of having turned a blind eye to the mass deportation and murder of Jews, named a saint."

The status of Pius XII was especially apropos in this regard. I'm tempted to say that his cause has been in Limbo ever since the Jews objected, except that Pope Benedict XVI doesn't believe in Limbo. The status of the causes of Pius XII and Father Dehon crossed my mind while attending a lecture by Archbishop Angelo Amato, prefect for the Congregation for the Causes of the Saints, who spoke on Secularism in Europe at Notre Dame, the same week *l'affaire* Williamson was raging in the press. Rather than listen to the archbishop shadow box with secularism, it would have been much more interesting to hear him explain how organized Jewry (hereafter, the Jews) had gained veto power over whom the Catholics were allowed to name as saints. The case of Pius XII, whose canonization is on hold, as well as the still unresolved case of Father Dehon, whose canonization was postponed because the Jews accused him of anti-Semitism, are only two cases in point. What implications did this stance have for church unity throughout history? Would it be possible, I wondered, for St. John Chrysostom to be canonized by the Church today? Certainly not, if *Adversos Iudeos* had to be vetted by the Italian Rabbis or Abe Foxman.

The unspoken but all-pervasive issue at the heart of *l'affaire* Williamson came down to a question of who was running the Catholic Church and whose dogmas had the final say in Church governance. Did Jewish concern over holocaust denial trump what Canon 1382 had to say about schism? If so why? Or were the Jews simply using this as an excuse to promote more division in the Church? Williamson himself had said on Dioscopus.blogspot.com that "the media uproar was surely timed and orchestrated to block the decree." The Jews, once again, were promoting division. Since the lifting of the excommunications was only the first step in repairing the Lefebvrite schism, the media attack was meant to ensure that that complete reconciliation would not happen.

Undeterred by the ADL's threat and their orchestration of the world media against the Church, the Vatican released the letter lifting the excommunications on Saturday, January 24. The Vatican's initial statements showed calm and resolve by trying to separate the two issues the Jews and the world press were determined to conflate, namely, schism and holocaust denial. "This act regards the lifting of the excommunications, period," Vatican spokesman Father Federico Lombardi told reporters, "It has nothing to do with the personal opinions of one person, which are open to criticism, but are not pertinent to this decree."

On January 28 at the end of his general audience on Wednesday, the pope reiterated the reasons that led to the lifting of the excommunications, none of which had anything to do with the Holocaust or how many people died or how they died:

Precisely in order to fulfill the service of unity, which distinguished in a special way my ministry as Successor of Peter, I decided a number of days ago to grant the remission of the excommunication that four bishops had incurred when they were ordained by Archbishop Lefebvre in 1988 without a pontifical mandate. I carried out this action of paternal tenderness because these bishops had repeatedly expressed to me their acute suffering over the situation in which they found themselves. I hope that this gesture of mine will be followed by concerted effort on their part to take the further steps necessary to realize full communion with the Church, testifying in this way to their true fidelity and true recognition of the magisterium and authority of the Pope and of Vatican Council II.

He concluded his daily Wednesday audience by saying that he wanted to "express my full and indisputable solidarity with our Brothers and Sisters who received the First Covenant, I trust that the memory of the Shoah will induce humankind to reflect upon the unpredictable power of evil when it conquers the heart of man."

The reports in the press invariably involved a skewing of the pope's words. Michelle Boorstein, writing for the *Washington Post*, wrote that Benedict told "pilgrims in his weekly audience in Vatican City that he feels 'full and indisputable' solidarity with Jews and repudiating the idea of denying the Holocaust."

"If the pope is in full solidarity with the Jews," one Catholic wondered

after reading the report in the *Washington Post*, "where does that leave us [Catholics]? Should we all become Jews?"

Boorstein went on to claim that Williamson "denied that the Holocaust occurred" when in fact (as she herself mentioned) his statements, however, lamentable, had to do with numbers and technicalities. The pope fared no better in Boorstein's account, an account full of misrepresentations like the following:

In his short tenure as pope, Benedict has caused concerns among other faith leaders before. He sparked deadly riots across the Muslim world in 2006 by citing a 14th century characterization of the prophet Muhammad as "evil and inhuman." Jewish groups protested in 2007 when he expanded use of traditional liturgy-a priority among groups such as St. Pius X -that on Good Friday called for Catholics to pray for "the faithless Jews." After protests, the next year he required all Catholics to remove the word "faithless." (*Washington Post*, January 28, 2009 "Pope voices support for Jews, rejects Holocaust denial.")

The Boorstein account in the *Washington Post* blundered from one error to another. At a certain point it became difficult to dismiss her ineptitude as simple incompetence. "Catholic officials," Boorstein continued, "say anti-Semitic comments by any of the bishops, while possibly abhorrent, are not heretical." The statement ignored the fact that no one in the Church had raised the issue of (much less defined the term) anti-Semitism, nor had anyone explained how questioning the details of how Jews died was anti-Semitic, according to any definition of the term.

As the volume of the outcry increased, Vatican resolve began to crumble, and comment began to proliferate, making a bad situation worse. As if to show that Rome could shoot itself in the foot without the help of the *Washington Post*, L'Osservatore Romano published an article by Anna Foa, a Jewish professor of history at the University of Rome "*La Sapienza*," on the topic of "*Negazionismo*," the Italian term for Holocaust denial. Foa's article, "Anti-Semitism is the only motive of the Deniers," was so apodictic it made papal bulls look like models of empirical induction by comparison. In contrast to the measured approach of Raul Hilberg, the Jewish dean of Holocaust studies, Foa, offering no evidence other than her ability as a mind reader, dismissed David Irving's credentials as an historian. She went on to claim that "Anti-Jewish hatred is at the origin of this denial. ... There is only

one motive, one intention, behind denial of the Holocaust: antisemitism. All the rest is lies."

On January 27, 2009, Bishop Bernard Fellay, the Superior General of the Society of St. Pius X, joined the Vatican's efforts at damage control when he announced that Bishop Williamson had been silenced. "Our Society claims no authority over historical or other secular matters," Fellay wrote. If so, then it was not clear why the Society was silencing him, since what Williamson said could not be construed as heretical or contrary to faith or morals. Again it came down to a question of who had the right to declare an action sinful, the Church or the World.

Writing from a traditionalist perspective, Christopher Ferrara had similar difficulties distinguishing between what the Church considers important and where she leaves her children the freedom to make up their own minds. Ferrara took issue with Andrew Rabel, who claimed

The SSPX reverts to the penalties given by Rome prior to the episcopal consecrations and all four bishops in the Society remain suspended *a divinis*. The society remains a group of Catholics in an irregular state. No chapel of the SSPX in the world is in communion with the Universal Church, and its priests sharing in the suspension are deprived of the clerical state (a separate matter from the validity of their ordinations). They cannot offer the sacraments of matrimony and penance validly because that requires faculties from a local bishop... But a significant hurdle in the way of full ecclesial communion for the Society, appears to have been removed.

Ferrara disputed the claims made by both George Weigel and Andrew Rabel, that the society remained in "an irregular state" but in so doing involved himself in bizarre self-contradictions. Ferrara claimed that the pope's action proved that the SSPX was never in schism in the first place, a claim which causes one to wonder why Ferrara is rejoicing at the lifting of the excommunications. In trying to explain his position, Ferrara only confuses the issue, as for instance when he writes:

To begin with, it can no longer be said by anyone in good faith that the four surviving bishops of the Society are "in schism." Further, those who have spent the past twenty years calumniating the priests and lay adherents of the Society as "schismatics" have finally been deprived of even the pretense of a canonical basis for this insult.

Well ,which is it? If there was nothing irregular about the state of the SSPX, why are we all rejoicing at the lifting of the excommunications? Brian Mershon attempted to bring clarity to the situation by writing to Msgr. Camille Perl, vice president of the Pontifical Commission Ecclesia Dei, who responded on May 23, 2008. In response to the question of whether the society is in schism, Perl refers to the Episcopal ordinations as "schismatic" but then adds

While it is true that participation in the Mass at chapels of the Society of St. Pius X does not of itself constitute "formal adherence to the schism" (cf. Ecclesia Dei 5, c), such adherence can come about over a period of time as one slowly imbibes a schismatic mentality which separates itself from the teaching of the Supreme Pontiff and the entire Catholic Church. While we hope and pray for a reconciliation with the Society of St. Pius X, the Pontifical Commission "Ecclesia Dei" cannot recommend that members of the faithful frequent their chapels for the reasons which we have outlined above. We deeply regret this situation and pray that soon a reconciliation of the Society of St. Pius X with the Church may come about, but until such time the explanations which we have given remain in force.

If the SSPX is not in schism now because of the lifting of the excommunications, then it would logically follow that they were in schism before the excommunications were lifted. But Ferrara can't bring himself to state either proposition clearly. Instead he argues that

in justice the Society and its one million adherents must now be seen by everyone as a bona fide "ecclesial movement" within the Catholic Church, with any remaining issues being precisions of canonical regularity to be resolved by further decrees.

Ferrara can't have it both ways. By claiming that the SSPX was not in an irregular situation before the lifting of the excommunications, he nullifies the point which the lifting of the excommunications made. But if what he says about schism is true, why did he add the word "now" to the previous passage? If there were no problems, why were there excommunications? If there was no lifting of the excommunications, why is Ferrara rejoicing?

The Brunt

Ferrara focuses the brunt of his attack on Bishop Williamson and accuses him of being a holocaust denier. In canonical terms this is known as straining at the gnat but swallowing the camel. Ferrara can't seem to distinguish between schism, which is a grave sin according to the authentic teaching of the Church, and discussions of how many people died in World War II and how they died, which, no matter how inane or unfounded these views might be, do not rise to the level of excommunicable offense, not in the Catholic Church at least. In order to have his excommunication lifted, Bishop Fellay had to make "the commitment to avoid every public intervention which does not respect the person of the Holy Father and which may be negative to ecclesial charity." It is a phrase that may have given Ferraro pause, but if so, not for long because Ferrara goes on to excuse his own attacks on the "conciliar popes" as

in keeping with the due liberty of the members of the Mystical Body, and indeed their duty to speak out when they believe in conscience that the common good of the Church is being harmed, even should that harm involve acts or omissions of the Supreme Pontiff himself.

Ferrara then goes on to impose the canons of political correctness on any traditionalist who doubts the conventional narrative of World War II. In fact, he continues,

It is time, then, for traditionalists to repudiate the inadmissible opinions of Bishop Richard Williamson, with due respect for his dignity as a descendant of the Apostles. For the good of the Church we must make it clear that the Bishop's opinions are not those of the worldwide "traditionalist movement" (if we must call it that). Above all, we must not allow the Society or the movement as a whole to be draped with the albatross of the Bishop's opinion on how many Jews perished at the hands of the Nazis.

Traditionalism, as espoused by Ferrara, is the Catholic world turned upside down. In this world it's acceptable to be a schism denier, but when it comes to thought crimes like "Holocaust denial," traditionalists of the Ferrara stripe are far less tolerant. This is precisely the attitude Msgr. Perl warned against when he wrote that "over a period of time ... one slowly imbibes a

schismatic mentality which separates itself from the teaching of the Supreme Pontiff and the entire Catholic Church." Traditionalists, in other words, can engage in all of the attacks on the papacy which Bishop Fellay had to abjure in order to have the excommunications lifted, as long as they tow the line on political correctness:

Therefore, not only this newspaper [*The Remnant*], but every journal of traditional Catholic opinion, and above all the Society itself, must clearly and unequivocally declare -- as I do here and now -- that Holocaust revisionism, wacky conspiracy theories, and other such nonsense will have no part in the traditionalist movement.

Ferrara's formulation of the issue is deeply schismatic in its orientation. Who cares about the so-called "traditionalist movement" or what its self-appointed leaders teach, or who they want to exclude from their "movement"? By defining themselves as a "movement," the traditionalists have separated themselves from the Church. The real issue is what the Catholic Church teaches, not what needs to be done to police "the movement."

Now that Ferrara has brought up the term in a theological context, what exactly is holocaust revisionism? Do Catholics now have to accept the Hitler's diaries as authentic? What about the stories of lampshades made out of the skin of Jewish concentration camp inmates? What about the flaming pits which gave the name to the holocaust? What about the electrocution and head-bashing machines? What about the touching story of the all-Negro 761st tank battalion which liberated the Jewish inmates of Buchenwald, as depicted on the PBS documentary "Liberators"? Was that part of the Holocaust narrative? If so, it was exposed as a hoax by Jeffrey Goldberg and others in the *New York Times*, which had previously given serious, if naïve, coverage to this story. What about the equally touching story of love in the concentration camps that was recounted on Oprah and exposed as a hoax the week before *l'affaire* Williamson broke? Professor David O'Connell was accused of going to "the brink of Holocaust Denial" by none other than thought cop Deborah Lipstadt for writing an article in [Culture Wars](#) about the inconsistencies in Elie Wiesel's holocaust narrative *Night*. Who knew that literary criticism could land you in jail?

Ferrara loses sight of the big issue in his rush to turn Bishop Williamson over to the thought police. The big issue at the heart of the

Williamson affair is religious. It has to do with which religion is true: Christianity or what Rabbi Jacob Neusner referred to as "the Judaism of Holocaust and Redemption." Elie Wiesel made the situation clear in 1971 when he claimed that "The sincere Christian knows that what died in Auschwitz was not the Jewish people but Christianity." *L'affaire Williamson* was an attempt on the part of the world's Jewish organizations to force the pope to accept their dogmas as normative for Catholics. It was an attempt to force Christians to accept what St. Paul in Titus 1:14 refers to as "Jewish fables" as superior to Christian dogmas. This is not to deny the reality of Jewish suffering during World War II. This admission, however, must be joined to a similar concession, namely, that no one can define the boundaries of the Holocaust narrative. Must Catholics accept parts of the Holocaust narrative which everyone now admits never happened? St. Paul tells us that there are "a great many people . . . who talk nonsense and try to make others believe it, particularly among those of the Circumcision." Instead of telling us to go along with these liars "who ruin whole families by teaching things which they ought not to, and doing it with the vile motive of making money," Paul tells Titus to "stop taking notice of Jewish myths." It's a message that Christopher Ferrara would do well to take to heart rather than demand that Bishop Williamson give his assent to a narrative full of "Jewish fables," many of which have gone down the memory hole over the past half century. Lest anyone think I am exaggerating we should remember that the ADL has denounced Norman Finkelstein as a Holocaust Denier (he has never doubted the existence of gas chambers or that millions of Jews were systematically killed) and that Alan Dershowitz has gone as far as to say that the leading expert on the Holocaust, Raul Hilberg, is to be found on the spectrum of Holocaust Denial because of his support of Finkelstein!

An Apology

Bishop Williamson issued an apology on January 28, 2009. In it he claimed that he was responsible for a "tremendous media storm stirred up by imprudent remarks of mine on Swedish television." Citing Jonas I: 12, Williamson suggested that the pope "Take me up and throw me into the sea; then the sea will quiet down for you; for I know it is because of me that this great tempest has come upon you."

Although Pope Benedict and Cardinal Castrillon Hoyos would have been happy to grant Bishop Williamson his wish, it wouldn't have helped. This storm was not of Bishop Williamson's making. Williamson's actions were indisputably "imprudent," as he himself admitted, but God was using them to bring about a long-overdue clarification of the Church's current position on the Jews, a position which can be traced back to the Vatican II document *Nostra Aetate* and is now codified in the Catechism of the Catholic Church, which claims that "The Church remains faithful to the interpretation of 'all the Scriptures'" concerning the crucifixion and death of Our Lord Jesus Christ. The Catechism tells us that "The personal sin of the participants (Judas, the Sanhedrin, Pilate) is known to God alone. . . . Hence, we cannot lay responsibility for the trial on the Jews in Jerusalem as a whole, despite the outcry of a manipulated crowd and the global reproaches contained in the apostles' calls to conversion after Pentecost." The Catechism ignores the distinction between the Jewish minority, who were ignorant and manipulated, and the majority, who hated Jesus and wanted him dead. The Scripture passages which the Catechism dismisses as "global reproaches" invariably insist on the guilt of the Jews not their ignorance. The difference is largely one of time. The more that time passed, the more convinced the Apostles became of Jewish guilt for rejecting Christ. *Nostra Aetate* tends to rely on Acts 3:17 and ignores I Thess 2: 14-15 as one of those "global reproaches." In that passage St. Paul addresses the community in Thessalonika as: "You, my brothers," who have been "suffering the same treatment from your own countrymen as they have suffered from the Jews, the people who put the Lord Jesus to death, and the prophets too. And now they have been persecuting us, and acting in a way that cannot please God and makes them the enemies of the whole human race. . . ."

The Catechism then goes on to propose *Nostra Aetate* ("Neither all Jews indiscriminately at that time, nor Jews today, can be charged with the

crimes committed during his Passion The Jews should not be spoken of as rejected or accursed as if this followed from Holy Scripture.") as the lens through which we must now interpret I Thess 2: 14-15.

As Bishop Fellay's comments on the lifting of the excommunications indicated, this move involves a total inversion of the hermeneutic of the Church. The world has been turned upside down. The same Church which traditionally specified that every council document should be read in the light of tradition is now saying that tradition should now be viewed in the light of a project ("the spirit of Vatican II" if you will) which turns the interpretations of one council into a meta-Magisterium.

Before long it becomes clear that the point of the Catechism's section on the Jews is not only to cast doubt on the literal meaning of passages like I Thess 2: 14-16 and a host of other passages, but also to exonerate the Jews from any responsibility for the passion and death of Christ. The main way the Catechism does this is by insisting then that "sinners were the authors and the ministers of all the sufferings that the divine Redeemer endured" and that "our crime in this case is greater in us than in the Jews."

This may be an indictment of sinful Christians, but it is hardly an exoneration of the Jews, even though it is always portrayed in that light. No matter what Abe Foxman says, it should be obvious that the terms "Jews" and "sinners" are not mutually exclusive categories. In fact the rejection of Jesus Christ and the collaboration in his murder makes all of the Jews involved in that conspiracy sinners. This indictment, of course, does not extend to the Jewish race as a whole, *i.e.*, to people like the Blessed Mother, the beloved disciple, the apostles, St. Paul, etc.: hence, the Church's ongoing and constant condemnation of anti-Semitism, which is totally irrational from a Christian perspective because it condemns the race which produced Jesus Christ.

However, it does mean that every Jew who called for Christ's death and asked that "his blood be on us and our children," as well as every Jew since that time who has rejected Jesus Christ shares responsibility for his death because of their participation in the sin of rejecting him. Paul addresses this on-going rejection of Logos when he says that the Jews "never stop trying to finish off the sins they have begun." As a result, "retribution is overtaking them at last." So *Nostra Aetate* is correct when it claims that Scripture proposes no "curse." The "retribution" which Paul describes comes about as a result not of some curse placed on the Jews; no, on the contrary, it flows naturally from their rejection of Logos.

But let's leave the accusation Paul levels against the Jews as "the people who put the Lord Jesus to death" aside for a moment. What about his claim that the Jews are "the enemies of the whole human race"? The Catechism, citing Vatican II, tells us that "The Jews should not be spoken of as rejected or accursed as if this followed from Holy Scripture." How are we then to reconcile these two statements? Once again the postconciliar Church is confronted with a hermeneutical issue of its own making. Do we interpret the Spirit of Vatican II in the light of tradition or do we interpret tradition in light of the Spirit of Vatican II?

By January 29, it was clear that this issue lay at the heart of the conflict and that it was going to reassert itself willy nilly even after Bishop Fellay silenced Bishop Williamson, because the repressed, as Sigmund Freud taught, always returns.

Shortly after Fellay and Schmidberger apologized for Williamson's remarks, an SSPX priest from northern Italy re-ignited the controversy by coming to Williamson's defense. Father Floriano Abrahamowicz, a priest from the northern Italian branch of the SSPX, came to Williamson's defense, claiming that he didn't know if Jews had been gassed either. He did say that Williamson had been "imprudent" to allow himself to be drawn into the topic. But, even so, Williamson, according to Abrahamowicz, did not deny that the Holocaust had happened; his doubts had to do with the "technical aspects of the gas chambers." No one was obligated to hold particular views about the English-American genocide which took place during the bombing of Dresden, Abrahamowicz opined. Why then was Auschwitz so special? Would Williamson be in trouble if he claimed that "only" 3,000 Germans died during the fire bombing of Dresden?

The Abrahamowicz story took a turn toward the heart of the matter when the priest, whose father is Jewish, claimed that he wanted the Jews to convert to Catholicism. "As a Catholic Christian," Abrahamowicz told the *Tribuna di Treviso*, a newspaper from the southern Tirol, "I wish that the Jews would receive Jesus Christ as their Lord. Amen." (Martin Zoeller, Jan 29, 2009, *Die Welt* "Zweiter Piusbruder zweifelt oeffentlich am Holocaust."). On February 6, Father Abrahamowicz was expelled from the SSPX for sedevacantism and statements disrespectful of the pope.

Shortly before Abrahamowicz was expelled, SSPX priest Father Pierpaolo Petrucci, prior of Rimini, defended both Williamson and Abrahamowicz, and in doing so got still closer to the heart of the matter,

which had to do with the disruptive effect that *Nostra Aetate* and the Church's "improved" relations with the Jews had on evangelization: "The Church," Petrucci said, "has gotten away from bringing up the truth as a way of bringing about conversion. The Church engages in dialogue, but no one preaches conversion."

Much was made of the fact that the Jewish Council in Germany as well as the Israeli Rabbinate broke off relations with the Vatican after the pope lifted the excommunications. Almost no one noticed that a week before *l'affaire* Williamson happened, the Italian rabbis broke their relations with the pope because of the changes he had made in the Good Friday prayer a year before. That fact, hardly noted in the ensuing furor, lent credence to both Abrahamowicz and Petrucci's analysis of what was really going on. If 50 years of dialogue could end this abruptly, one has to wonder what was achieved. Was there a relationship there to begin with? Or had dialogue become a pretext for something else? Had it become what David O'Connell claimed when he wrote in *Culture Wars* that "In the 40 years since Vatican II, this alleged 'dialogue' has actually turned out to be a one way street in which the Jewish side ritually denounces Catholics and Catholicism while the Catholics nod in approval." Reacting to the rabbis' announcement, Vatican spokesman Federico Lombardi hoped that the dialogue would return to its formerly "serene" state, but there seemed little hope of that now.

Before long, however, Rome began to crumble under the pressure. Instead of just letting the dogs bark as the caravan passed by, the Vatican began issuing statements which made Professor Foa's comments seem judicious by comparison. By the end of the week, Father Lombardi was beginning to sound like Elie Wiesel. "He who negates the Shoah, denies God!" was the headline Suedtirol.online put over Lombardi's theological lucubrations (Vatican: "*Wer die Shoah negiert, verleugnet Gott.*" 1/30/09 www.stol.it).

According to John Allen, it was the Abrahamowicz interview which "prompted the Vatican Spokesman, Jesuit Fr. Lombardi to go on Vatican Radio to say that 'he who denies the fact of the Shoah knows nothing of the mystery of God nor of the cross of Christ.'" Holocaust denial is "even more serious," Lombardi said, when it "comes from the mouth of a priest or bishop, meaning a Christian minister, whether or not he's in union with the Catholic Church."

"What recent events make clear," Allen continued,

is that there are two camps in the small universe that rotates around the Society of St. Pius X. The first, represented by Fellay, is composed of traditionalists whose concerns are solely liturgical and doctrinal, and who see the future of their movement as a leaven within the formal structures of the church; the second, represented by Williamson and Abrahamowicz, includes people for whom theological traditionalism bleeds off into far-right politics, xenophobia, and conspiracy theories.

Evidently Cardinal Dario Castrillon Hoyos didn't know about either camp. "We absolutely didn't know anything about this Williamson. I really think that no one was aware of it," Cardinal Dario Castrillon Hoyos was quoted as saying in an interview published in *Corriere della Sera*.

It was a statement Allen found implausible: "Claims that the Vatican was caught off-guard don't cut it; well before Williamson appeared on Swedish TV, he had a public record of Holocaust denial and antagonism toward Jews which a 30-second Google search would have unearthed" ("The Lefebvrite case: What was the Vatican thinking?" NCRonline, January 30, 2009):

In 1989, for example, police in Canada briefly considered filing charges against Williamson under that country's hate speech laws after he gave an address in Quebec charging that Jews were responsible for "changes and corruption" in the Catholic Church, that "not one Jew" perished in Nazi gas chambers, and that the Holocaust was a myth created so that the West would "approve the state of Israel" (NCR, Jan 26, 2009, John L. Allen, Jr. "Lefebvre movement: long, troubled history with Judaism").

Allen then muddied the theological waters by citing passages from the SSPX website which indicated, in his view, that "The historical association between some strains of traditionalist Catholicism and anti-Semitism run deep." Those strains include the fact that "Traditionalists often uphold a robust missionary theology, insisting that the church cannot renounce its duty to evangelize any group, including Jews." Those strains also include the fact that, "The SSPX . . . issued a statement asserting that 'a Catholic cannot be anti-Semitic without destroying the origin and essence of his own faith.'" An unbiased observer might conclude that statements like that would exonerate the SSPX from the charge of anti-Semitism, but Allen hints that the statement is mere window dressing to cover over "a track record in some traditionalist

and Lefebvrite circles of open hostility toward Jews and Judaism that is anything but latent." For example, "In just the past year, controversy arose in Germany when a priest of the fraternity asserted that Jews were 'coresponsible' for the death of Christ." Did he cite 1 Thess 2:15, perhaps?

Missing from Allen's account was a clear distinction between anti-Semitism, which is wrong, and the anti-Jewish polemic which is part of the fabric of the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of St. Paul and virtually every Father of the Church and an inextricable part of the Catholic faith. *L'affaire Williamson* presented a golden opportunity to make this distinction, but no one, not the pope, not the Vatican, not the traditionalists, not the pundits, seemed willing or capable of making it. Allen to his credit did say that "if it is not arrested, a schism can become self-replicating and produce a parallel church." The schism had hurt all of the parties involved. It prevented the purification of the traditionalism which the SSPX was promoting, but it also put the Church the Lefebvrites had left behind into the unnatural position of denying its own tradition in the name of Vatican II.

Allen's report on the murky underside of the SSPX was only the tip of the iceberg. If the Jews were interested in damaging evidence against the SSPX they should have consulted *Fidelity Magazine*, in particular Thomas W. Case's article, "The Society of St. Pius X Gets Sick," in the October 1992 issue, p. 28 or In the Line of Fire: John Rizzo, Ex-SSPX by Michael Mazza, *Fidelity*, May 1995 or a series of articles on the SSPX and schism by John Beaumont. Of course, if the Southern Poverty Law Center had done this, it would have undermined their case against me as a Nazi. Nevertheless, in Case's article, they would have read that

In 1989 Williamson delivered some speeches in Canada that caused some consternation and got him investigated for possible "hate crimes" by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. In Sherbrooke, Quebec, he said "there was not one Jew killed in the gas chambers. It was all lies, lies, lies. The Jews created the Holocaust so we would prostrate ourselves on our knees before them and approve the new State of Israel . . . Jews made up the Holocaust. Protestants get their orders from the devil, and the Vatican sold its soul to liberalism."

The Williamson story, in other words, has been out for 20 years and was reported on 17 years ago in *Culture Wars'* predecessor *Fidelity*. Tom Case's article makes clear that Bishop Williamson was far from the most

extreme member of the SSPX:

Father Ramon Angles (rector of the Pius X academy and the college in St. Mary's Kansas) has an apartment full of Nazi paraphernalia, which he shows to favored boys. He shows them the Nazi ceremonial daggers worn by officers of the Third Reich. He is proud of the vintage Mercedes owned by his family which was owned by Adolf Hitler. A one-time student at the academy was favored by a special meeting with Father Angles a couple of years ago. In his private room on campus, Angles treated him and a friend to a pizza and a showing of the Nazi propaganda film *Triumph of the Will*.

He played the film back, stopping it in places commenting with fervor and reading back from the stack of Hitler speech transcripts he had at his side. Leni Riefenstahl, the film's producer and a chief propagandist for the Third Reich is still alive and resides in South America. Father Angles visits her often (he informs the students) and boasts of the association.

Case also recounted the case of Father Gregory Post, the first American priest ordained into the SSPX, who

arrived at the San Jose, California airport dressed in the full regalia of an SS army officer, complete with helmet, boots and swastika arm bands. San Jose Pius X members who picked him up at the airport were indignant, and the then district superior of the society had to fly out to San Jose to reprimand the priest and cool off the situation.

This and other anecdotes led Case to conclude that "There is a virulent sickness of hatred and Hitlerism running through the traditional Catholic movement."

Lest anyone think that personal animus was the driving force behind the Case article, *Fidelity* ran a follow up piece three years later "In the Line of Fire: John Rizzo, Ex-SSPX" (*Fidelity*, May 1995), in which Michael Mazza recounts a conversation that former SSPX priest Father Rizzo had with Ramon Angles:

All of a sudden, without any provocation whatsoever, he got up and went over to his bookshelf. He pulled out this huge book with the title *The Life of Adolf Hitler* and a big picture of Hitler on the cover giving his salute. He put it on the bridge of his nose, the same way the sub-

deacon holds up the Book of the Gospels at a solemn High mass. He walked around the coffee table in his apartment, making the noise of a thurible ("ching ching ching ching"). After he sat down he says, "Well, Rizzo, what do you think of that? Isn't this great?" He was laughing quite devilishly. He then asked, "What else do you want to talk about?"

When told about Ramon's antics, "Father Peter Scott ... reportedly responded: "What can I do? I'm afraid of Father Angles." Father Rizzo had similar experiences when he decided to leave the SSPX. On the advice of the legal authorities, Rizzo began wearing a bulletproof vest.

A little over a year after Mazza's article castigating the SSPX appeared in *Fidelity*, the editor of that magazine got a phone call from a man with a British accent. It was Bishop Williamson and he was calling me not to tell me to wear a bullet proof vest but to congratulate me on my book [Monsters from the Id](#). I was dumbfounded. After 30 years of logomachy I can count calls like this on the fingers of one hand.

That conversation led to Bishop Williamson staying at our house not once but twice. During those stays he got to have dinner with the Jones family a number of times, and he made a favorable impression on all of us. After his visit, there was a standing joke in the Jones family: "What's the difference between a bishop who has been excommunicated and a bishop in good standing with the Church?"

Answer: "Excommunicated bishops don't hold grudges."

Bishop Williamson's visit then led to an invitation which he extended to me to speak on horror films at the SSPX seminary in Winona. My visit to Winona and the conversations we had there only confirmed my first impression. Williamson was a man of intelligence-his analysis of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony, illustrated by performing excerpts on the piano, is one of the best pieces of musical criticism I ever heard or read-and wit. During the preparations for the talk, Bishop Williamson and I had to vet the film clips I assembled to illustrate my point. "No R rated films," he said, "*Fidelity* might do an expose on us if they found out."

During the question period after my talk, one of the seminarians asked me whether there were similarities between the monsters and the Novus Ordo Mass. When I answered in the negative, he blurted out, "Well, aren't you a traditionalist?"

"No," I answered.

"Well, then what are you doing here?"

The answer to that question was Bishop Williamson, a man who possesses both intelligence and magnanimity, a rare combination in any man these days, and even rarer in a bishop.

There is another answer to that question, and that answer is Christianity. Unlike Jews who are often exhorted never to forget and never to forgive, Christians are taught to do both. Hate, we all learned by reading *First Things*, is a Jewish virtue. The fact that I published what I did about the SSPX and Williamson and that it did not lead to hatred is a tribute to Bishop Williamson as a man but also to the religion we both share, a religion which demands both fraternal correction and forgiveness. That is what *l'affaire Williamson* is all about. It's about whether, as Yuri Slezkine claims in *The Jewish Century*, we have all become Jews.

Tom Case said that the main reason Lefebvre's May 1988 agreement with the Church fell through was the question of the bishops. Lefebvre, Case wrote,

had presented the names of potential bishops and Rome had demurred. The selection of bishops is a touchy subject. With papal approval, it is perfectly legitimate. Without papal approval, it is a schismatic act and an excommunicable offense. . . . The real problem of the bishops, in this instance, was not when, but who? . . . Rome had an extensive dossier on the men favored for consecration. And that is why the pope reserves to himself the right of approval, and why it is such a grave act to consecrate a bishop without it. It is not a technical matter, but a measure to protect the Faith. How could Rome ever approve a bishop who really believed that the pope was a tool of the Freemasons?

Richard Williamson, according to Case, was the candidate who caused the most consternation in Rome. And it was Williamson, according to Case, who persuaded Lefebvre to renege on his agreement when he returned from Rome after signing the May 5 accord. "There were too many in the Society (meaning Williamson and company) who simply had not trust in Rome at all. Under that pressure, the Archbishop changed his mind." One of the things Rome found most objectionable was Williamson's views on the Jews. In a Letter from Winona, dated February 1, 1991, Williamson wrote that "Until [the Jews] discover their true Messianic vocation [by conversion to Christ], they may be expected to continue fanatical agitation in accordance with their false messianic vocation of Jewish world-dominion, to prepare the Anti-

Christ's throne in Jerusalem. . . the wise Catholic will remember that, again, the ex-Christian nations have only their own Liberalism to blame for allowing the free circulation within Christendom to the enemies of Christ. ..."

It was hard not to see God's hand in all of this. Or was it another instance of the return of the repressed? Rome would have never approved Williamson as a bishop, but the fact that he ended up a bishop anyway may have been God's way of saying that some divine intervention was needed to solve the problems Rome had shown itself incapable or unwilling to resolve, in particular questions involving the Church's relations with the Jews. The Lefebvrite Schism has hurt both parties. The harm to the SSPX should be obvious by now. But the Church was harmed as well by becoming a de facto bastion of anti-Tradition, especially on the question of the Jews. If God was trying to teach the Church a lesson in the Williamson affair, the Church was showing reluctance to learn even in the expensive school of experience. Rome seemed determined to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory in the Williamson affair as the agonizing of the first few days soon led to a phase of second guessing and buck passing. One report had Cardinal Re in a bus full of bishops heading to a liturgical celebration at Santa Maria Maggiore mocking Cardinal Castrillon-Hoyos as a hopeless buffoon for his mishandling of the excommunications. The *New York Times* (NYT, January 26, 2009, Rachel Donadio, "Healing Schism, Pope Risks Another") portrayed Cardinal Walter Kasper, the director of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity and the liaison for Vatican-Jewish relations, as distancing himself from a debacle that was not of his making. Kasper claimed that he had not been consulted. "It was a decision of the pope," the cardinal said in a telephone interview. A few days later, Kasper was quoted as complaining about "management mistakes" and "lack of communication in the Vatican."

Less invidious, but along the same lines, was a John Allen article which lectured the Vatican on Public Relations 101. Allen called the handling of the lifting of the excommunications "a colossal blunder" and "stunningly inept." Allen claimed that "The Vatican under Benedict XVI still has not learned the lessons of Regensburg."

Well, maybe so, but Allen never gets around to telling us just what the lessons of Regensburg were. Was it that the media can create incidents to embarrass the pope and the church? Was it that the media can stir up lynch mobs in both Germany and Islamic countries? Or were there deeper lessons involved in the Williamson affair which John Allen still hasn't learned, as, for

example, the lesson which the Catholic Catechism (para 581) drew from pondering Jesus's relation to the Jews: "Jesus could not help but offend the teachers of the Law for he was not content to propose his interpretation along side theirs, but taught the people 'as one who had authority, and not as their scribes.'"

The lesson the Catechism proposed applied to both Christ and Christ's vicar on earth, the pope. Jesus knew intuitively that public relations was not going to save him from suffering in his dealings with the Jews. His followers had to learn this lesson the hard way. The real lesson of Regensburg was that the Jewish-controlled media will use any pretext to stir up animosity against the pope and discord within the Catholic Church? Better public relations techniques, Allen seems to be claiming, could have avoided this debacle. But is that true?

If so, the pope was no stranger to the theological version of public relations. Cardinal Ratzinger tried to finesse the Jewish question (*i.e.*, how good relations with the Jews squares with the Gospel admonition to work for their conversion) years before he became pope. In *Reconciling Gospel and Torah: the Catechism*, Cardinal Ratzinger wrote that

The history of the relationship between Israel and Christendom is drenched with blood and tears. It is a history of mistrust and hostility, but also, thank God, a history marked again and again by attempts at forgiveness, understanding and mutual acceptance. After Auschwitz, the mission of reconciliation and acceptance permits no deferral. Does this hostility result from something in the very faith of Christians? Is it something in the "essence of Christianity," such that one would have to prescind from Christianity's core, deny Christianity its heart, in order to come to real reconciliation? This is an assumption that some Christian thinkers have in fact made in the last few decades in reaction to the horrors of history. Do confession of Jesus of Nazareth as the Son of the living God and faith in the cross as the redemption of mankind contain an implicit condemnation of the Jews as stubborn and blind, as guilty of the death of the Son of God? Could it be that the core of the faith of Christians themselves compels them to intolerance, even to hostility toward the Jews, and conversely, that the self-esteem of Jews and the defense of their historic dignity and deepest convictions oblige them to demand that Christians abandon the heart of their faith and so require Jews similarly to forsake tolerance? Is the conflict programmed in the

heart of religion and only to be overcome by its repudiation?

To begin with, Cardinal Ratzinger is looking into the wrong end of the telescope. The hostility in question doesn't result "from something in the very faith of Christians." It is the inexorable result of the Jewish rejection of Logos. But, conceding that, "the question remains: Can Christian faith, left in its inner power and dignity, not only tolerate Judaism but accept it in its historic mission? Or can it not? Can there be true reconciliation without abandoning the faith, or is reconciliation tied to such abandonment?"

The Right Questions

Ratzinger is nothing if not acute in his ability to formulate the right questions. But in spite of that ability, he seems equally determined to avoid the obvious answers which both Scripture and Tradition have always given to these questions. As of the death of Christ, Judaism had no historical mission because, as of the destruction of the Temple, Judaism, as understood by Moses, ceased to exist. This is not to say that the Jewish people will play no distinctive role in the end times. Rather than go directly to Scripture, Ratzinger turns to the Catechism in order to maximize the claims he plans to make because, as he puts it: "This work has been published by the magisterium of the Catholic Church as an authentic expression of her faith. In recognition of the significance of Auschwitz and from the mission of the Second Vatican Council, the matter of reconciliation has been inscribed in the catechism as an object of faith."

Unfortunately, the passages he cites have to do with the moral law and not the Jews. As a result they can't answer the questions he raises and so when Ratzinger says that:

The mission of Jesus consists in leading the histories of the nations into the community of the history of Abraham, in the history of Israel. His mission is unification, reconciliation, as the Letter to the Ephesians (2:18-22) will then present it. The history of Israel should become the history of all, Abraham's sonship become extended to the 'many.'

Conversely, this means that all nations, without the abolishment of the special mission of Israel, become brothers and receivers of the promises of the chosen people, they become people of God with Israel through adherence to the will of God and through acceptance of the Davidic Kingdom.

This is true but it does not deal with the fundamental issue, namely the Jewish hostility to Christ and their ongoing rejection of Logos. Ratzinger's text is littered with statements that are undeniably true, but something prevents him from uniting these statements into a coherent thesis:

Old and New Testaments, Jesus and the Sacred Scripture of Israel, appear here as indivisible. . . . Reconciliation in the common recognition of the kingdom of God . . . One understands nothing about him if one does not enter with him into the dynamic of reconciliation. . . . He was

"to fulfill the law . . . With these statements we find ourselves at the center of the Christian-Jewish dialogue, we reach the juncture where we are faced with the decisive choice between reconciliation and alienation. . . . Beyond all historic and strictly theological discussions, we find ourselves placed in the middle of the question of the present responsibility of Jews and Christians before the modern world. This responsibility consists precisely in representing the truth of the one will of God before the world and thus placing man before this inner truth, which is at the same time his way. Jews and Christians must bear witness to the one God, to the Creator of Heaven and Earth and do this in that entirety which Psalm 19 formulates in an exemplary way.

Then, as if to say that he hasn't convinced himself, Ratzinger comes back to the same nagging question: "Does such a view of the relationship between the law and the Gospel not come down to an unacceptable attempt at harmonization?" Ratzinger seems haunted by the fact that the answer to that question, in spite of the project of Vatican II, seems to be 'yes.' The more scriptural evidence he brings us (and he doesn't bring up much) the more he undermines his own argument:

How does one explain then the conflict which led to Jesus's cross? Does all of this not stand in contradiction to St. Paul's interpretation of the figure of Jesus? Are we not denying here the entire Pauline doctrine of grace in favor of a new moralism, thereby abolishing . . . the essential innovation of Christianity? . . . Reconciliation and separation appear thus to be tied up in a virtually insolvable paradox.

In the catechism's theology of the New Testament, the cross cannot simply be viewed as an accident which actually could have been avoided nor as the sin of Israel with which Israel becomes eternally stained in contrast to the pagans for whom the cross signifies redemption. In the New Testament there are not two effects of the cross: a damning one and a saving one, but only a single effect, which is saving and reconciling.

Instead of seeing the cross as proof that reconciliation on human terms is impossible and conflict with the Jews is unavoidable, Ratzinger switches horses in mid-stream and appeals to the Catechism as a kind of *deus ex machina* that gets him out of trouble and lends an aura of infallibility by bringing up issues that are beside the point, namely,

Jews are not collectively responsible for Jesus's death" The catechism recalls that esteemed Jewish personages were followers of Jesus according to the witness of the Gospels, that according to St. John, shortly before Jesus's death "many even of the authorities believed in him" (Jn 12:42). . . . St. James is also mentioned, who commented, "How many thousands there are among the Jews of those who have believed; they are all zealous for the law" (Acts 21:20). Thus it is elucidated that the report of Jesus's trial cannot substantiate a charge of collective Jewish guilt. The Second Vatican Council is expressly cited: "Neither all Jews indiscriminately at that time, nor Jews today, can be charged with the crimes committed during his passion . . . The Jews should not be spoken of as rejected or accursed as if this followed from Holy Scripture. . . . All sinners were the authors of Christ's passion.

Personal Narrative

At this point Ratzinger's narrative shifts from the infallible to the personal, "Already as a child," he tells us, "I could not understand how some people wanted to derive a condemnation of Jews from the death of Jesus because the following thought had penetrated my soul as something profoundly consoling: Jesus's blood raises no calls for retaliation but calls all to reconciliation."

What Church document calls for retaliation? "*Sicut Iudeis non . . .*," the official Church teaching on the Jews for the millennium between the time when Pope St. Gregory the Great first formulated it until *Nostra Aetate*, stated specifically, repeatedly and unequivocally, that no one had the right to harm the Jew. *Nostra Aetate* did not repudiate "*Sicut Iudeis non . . .*"; it simply ignored it and proposed in its stead a number of statements which got turned into an experiment, which was not part of the original text. Ratzinger articulates that the aspiration behind that experiment, which could also be seen as a "hope" or a fantasy, when he writes:

Jews and Christians should accept each other in profound inner reconciliation, neither in disregard of their faith nor in its denial, but out of the depth of faith itself. In their mutual reconciliation they should become a force for peace in and for the world. Through their witness to the one God, who cannot be adored apart from the unity of love of God and neighbor, they should open the door into the world for this God so that his will be done and so that it become on earth "as it is in heaven," "so that his kingdom come."

Who can disagree with a statement like this? It is indisputably true to say that Jews "should become a force for peace in and for the world," and they probably would do so, if it were not for their tragic rejection of Logos, a rejection which made them "enemies of the whole human race." "Should" is the key word here. Ratzinger can only promote his vision, the experiment of Vatican II, by ignoring the clear testimony of the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of St. Paul, the Church Fathers, and the teaching of the medieval Church based upon "*Sicut Iudeis non . . .*" about what kind of people the Jews became when they rejected Christ, the Logos, and how Christians were supposed to deal with them. In the final analysis, Cardinal Ratzinger is giving expression to a personal vision, which no matter how

laudable (or naïve) is not a theological reality. Vatican II was a valid council which gave birth to a hope which became a shared fantasy as time went on. Vatican II gave birth to an experiment based on the premise that the Church had nothing to fear from the modern world. That experiment involved accepting certain terms as the world defined them, and one of those terms was "Jew," and another was "anti-Semitism." In the aftermath of Vatican II, the Church appeared to accept the Enlightenment's definition of the Jew, as proposed by thinkers like Lessing in *Nathan der Weise*. There was no theological reality at the foundation of this experiment, and so it was doomed to failure, a failure we are now witnessing as it unfolds in front of us.

The theological reality of the situation can be found in Scripture, which ultimately defines the Jew for us as the rejecter of Christ and Logos and, therefore, a follower of Satan, as described in John 8. Or as "enemies of the whole human race," as Paul puts it, or as "the synagogue of Satan." "The Jews," according to St. Paul, are "the people who put the Lord Jesus to death, and the prophets too. And now they have been persecuting us, and acting in a way that cannot please God and makes them the enemies of the whole human race, because they are hindering us from preaching to the pagans and trying to save them. They never stop trying to finish off the sins they have begun, but retribution is overtaking them at last." The note from the New American Bible informs us:

Paul is speaking of historical opposition on the part of Palestinian Jews in particular and does so only some 20 years after Jesus's crucifixion. Even so, he quickly proceeds to depict the persecutors typologically, in apocalyptic terms. His remarks give no grounds for anti-Semitism to those willing to understand him, especially in view of St. Paul's pride in his own ethnic and religious background.

We concur. The conclusion derived from St. Paul's epistle to the Thessalonians is inescapable. A Christian cannot be anti-Semitic, but a Christian must be anti-Jewish. Christians who attempt to minimize the anti-Jewish nature of the Catholic faith invariably end up denying both the Gospel and Tradition. The most basic fact of Jewish-Christian dialogue has to be a candid admission that the Catholic faith is, as Mischa Brumlich put it in 1989, "*judenfeindlich*." If the Jews want to talk to us after we admit that fact, then maybe Jewish-Catholic dialogue will have some purpose after all, but sooner or later the Church is going to have to accept this fact because it is

part of the DNA of Christianity and not even a mind as great as that of Pope Benedict XVI can finesse this fundamental conflict.

This is also, of course, the fundamental clarification which the Jews by their constant and indiscriminate use of the term "anti-Semitism" want to obscure. There are over one billion Catholics in the world. And yet as of the third week of the Williamson crisis not one had stepped forward to say that there was a fundamental difference between *Mein Kampf* and the writings of St. Paul, and, more importantly, that the use of the term "anti-Semitism" is not an accurate account of what both Adolf Hitler and St. Paul believed.

To be fair, Cardinal Ratzinger made precisely this point ten years ago when the Church released the document entitled "*We Remember: A Reflection on the Shoah*" in 1998. As Gustav Niehbuhr wrote in the *New York Times* on March 29, 1998, "We Remember" "bluntly condemns the Nazi genocide and calls the church to repentance on behalf of Catholics who did nothing to stop it. But it also carefully distinguishes between centuries of 'anti-Judaism' as a religious teaching and the Nazis' murderous anti-Semitism which, the document says, had its 'roots outside Christianity.'" A comment like this was crying out to be made during the Williamson affair, but instead of clarifying the issue, the church relied on "spokesmen" like Matthias Kopp, as the mouthpiece of the German bishops, and allowed them to muddy the waters by claiming that the Church must fight "every form of anti-Semitism" without even a remote attempt to define the term. Sooner or later the Church is going to have to make the distinction between being anti-Semitic which is wrong, sinful, and stupid, and being anti-Jewish, which, correctly understood, is a virtue for Christians. It looks as if the only way that this is going to happen is for God to drag the Church kicking and screaming to where it does not want to go, through incidents like the Williamson affair.

Failure to distinguish between anti-Semitism and anti-Judaism continued to drive the crisis by allowing discourse to revolve around an undefined term. As we have come to expect in circumstances like this, two officious rabbis stepped forward and offered the pope unbidden advice on "What the Pope should do to Reassure the World," (*Washington Post*, 1/30/09). Abraham Cooper and Yitzchok Adlerstein, as we have come to expect, insist that the pope inform the SSPX that "that there is no turning back the clock on the teachings of Vatican II," which is to say, on their interpretation of Vatican II, as removing "the effects of hundreds of years of Church-inspired anti-Semitism and persecution." Vatican II, according to the

rabbis, "also helped bring Catholicism firmly into an age of modernity," and that "allowed hundreds of millions of Catholics to escape the tension between modernity and sincere religious belief." These Catholics, the rabbis tell us, "do not want to see a return to the medieval abbey."

It's touching to hear that Rabbis Cooper and Adlerstein want to promote Church teaching, but by now, 50 years after *Nostra Aetate*, Jewish zeal for Catholic teaching raises skepticism about ulterior motives and suspicions that their zeal is more bound up with the Jews' insatiable desire to control discourse than any desire to promote the Catholic faith. What the rabbis really want is control of the Catholic Church, through control of the categories of ecclesial discourse. The healing of the schism was a threat to this status quo.

Sandro Magister, ("No more excommunication for the Lefebvrists. But Peace is still far off, Chiesa online) supported the same status quo from inside the Catholic Church. According to Magister, "The fundamental reason behind the uproar is the anti-Jewish theology that generally distinguishes the Lefebvritsts. According to many Jews, the Catholic Church does too little to oppose this anti-Judaism and demand that its supporters recant." Once the argument gets framed in terms of "anti-Judaism," the next question becomes, "Is the Church anti-Jewish?" That question can be answered by reading the Scriptures and Vatican II and interpreting the latter in terms of the former, which seems to be the *modus operandi* of the pope, who according to Magister, told the Roman Curia on December 22, 2005, that "Vatican II did not mark any rupture with the tradition of the Church, but was in continuity with this even where it seemed to mark a clear break with the past. . . ."

The SSPX is right. There is a crisis. Unfortunately, Bishop Fellay is reluctant to say where the most glaring break with tradition has occurred, namely, on the question of the Church's relation to the Jews.

The crisis manifests itself by a debilitating lack of clarity, as when Magister writes:

At the Angelus on Saturday, January 25, Benedict spoke boldly about the "conversion" of Paul, a Jew. He even said that for Paul, the term "conversion" is improper, "because he was already a believer in fact a fervent Jew, nor did he have to abandon the Jewish faith in order to adhere to Christ."

The Rabbis from Los Angeles were, if anything, moderate in

comparison to other Jewish leaders. Alan Dershowitz entered the Williamson affair when he accused Cardinal Martino of anti-Semitism for saying that Gaza "resembles a big concentration camp." Dershowitz, like the rabbis, is an expert on canon law, an expertise he exhibits in the following train of syllogisms:

Any comparison between Israel's action in Gaza and those of Nazis during the Holocaust is not only obscene, it is blatantly anti-Semitic, which is supposed to be a sin under Vatican law. (It is apparently not, however, a sin for a Catholic bishop to deny that the Holocaust occurred at all, since Bishop Richard Williamson of Great Britain was welcomed back into the Catholic church after claiming that there were no gas chambers and that the Jews are lying when they say that 6 million of them were killed, when according to that bigot in robes, a mere 300,000 Jews died during the entire Holocaust).

Dershowitz then invoked the principle of double effect to justify Israeli actions in Gaza:

An essential aspect of Christian teaching, and especially of Catholic teaching, is the important principle that distinguishes between intentionally killing an innocent person, and unintentionally killing an innocent person in the process of legitimately trying to prevent harm to one's self or others. This concept, known as the principle of double effect, is central to Catholic theology. It traces its roots to Thomas Aquinas and has had enormous influence on moral thinking not only within the Catholic Church, but throughout Christianity and indeed in the secular world as well. Understanding and complying with this principle may literally mean the difference between eternal damnation and eternal salvation. That's how important it is.

Dershowitz's claim to the principle of double effect is based on an even more dubious claim, namely, that Israeli Defense Forces may have "inadvertently" killed "some Palestinian civilians" but only because they were "used as human shields by Hamas."

Dershowitz then lashes out at the Catholic Church, claiming that the pope is "anti-Catholic" because

The Pope himself has been guilty of invoking such moral equivalence between these very different actions. Indeed it is fair to say

that the Vatican's entire approach to the Israel-Hamas conflict has been to suggest a false moral equivalence. . . . Church leaders know better. They understand precisely what they are doing. They are making utilitarian, pragmatic and very anti-Catholic cynical judgments calculated to bolster the influence of The Church in the Middle East. It might be understandable for secular nations to act in so amoral, if not immoral, a manner, but it is entirely unacceptable for the Catholic Church, which eschews utilitarianism and preaches moral consistency and absolutism to act in so cynical a way.

This is especially troubling, because the church tends to forget its own teachings primarily when it deals with the Jewish people and the Jewish state. Its long history of discrimination and bigotry against Jews-slaughtering entire Jewish communities on the way to the Crusades, murdering entire Jewish communities during the inquisitions, fomenting pogroms, and signing a pact with Hitler during the Holocaust-should make it even more concerned about applying a double standard of morality to the Jewish state. But that's exactly what it does. And then it complains when critics point to this obvious double standard.

Dershowitz's comments are a good indication of the fruits of nearly 50 years of Catholic-Jewish dialogue. Just think how intemperate Dershowitz might have been without the benign influence of *Nostra Aetate* guiding him. His comments about the Church "signing a pact with Hitler during the Holocaust," nonetheless, raises interesting historical parallels. It recalls Matthias Kopp's statement about the Vatican's pact with Israel in 1993, the ongoing genocide the Israelis have been waging against the Palestinians, and the Church's very real (if not total) silence in the face of this holocaust. Dershowitz may invoke the principle of double effect as informing the IDF's strategy and claim that the 1300 Palestinians who perished there during the last two weeks of December 2008 died as a result of being used as "human shields" by Hamas, but Noam Chomsky's account of what happened in Gaza tells a different story. According to Chomsky the Saturday December 27 attack on Gaza

had been meticulously planned, for over 6 months according to the Israeli press. The planning had two components: military and propaganda. It was based on the lessons of Israel's 2006 invasion of Lebanon, which was considered to be poorly planned and badly

advertised. We may, therefore, be fairly confident that most of what has been done and said was pre-planned and intended.

That surely includes the timing of the assault: shortly before noon, when children were returning from school and crowds were milling in the streets of densely populated Gaza City. It took only a few minutes to kill over 225 people and wound 700, an auspicious opening to the mass slaughter of defenseless civilians trapped in a tiny cage with nowhere to flee.

In his retrospective "Parsing Gains of Gaza War," *New York Times* correspondent Ethan Bronner cited this achievement as one of the most significant of the gains. Israel calculated that it would be advantageous to appear to "go crazy," causing vastly disproportionate terror, a doctrine that traces back to the 1950s. "The Palestinians in Gaza got the message on the first day," Bronner wrote, "when Israeli warplanes struck numerous targets simultaneously in the middle of a Saturday morning. Some 200 were killed instantly, shocking Hamas and indeed all of Gaza." The tactic of "going crazy" appears to have been successful, Bronner concluded: there are "limited indications that the people of Gaza felt such pain from this war that they will seek to rein in Hamas," the elected government. That is another long-standing doctrine of state terror. I don't, incidentally, recall the *Times* retrospective "Parsing Gains of Chechnya War," though the gains were great.

The meticulous planning also presumably included the termination of the assault, carefully timed to be just before the inauguration, so as to minimize the (remote) threat that Obama might have to say some words critical of these vicious US-supported crimes.

Two weeks after the Sabbath opening of the assault, with much of Gaza already pounded to rubble and the death toll approaching 1000, the UN Agency UNRWA, on which most Gazans depend for survival, announced that the Israeli military refused to allow aid shipments to Gaza, saying that the crossings were closed for the Sabbath. To honor the holy day, Palestinians at the edge of survival must be denied food and medicine, while hundreds can be slaughtered by US jet bombers and helicopters.

The rigorous observance of the Sabbath in this dual fashion attracted little if any notice. That makes sense. In the annals of US-Israeli criminality, such cruelty and cynicism scarcely merit more than a footnote. They are too familiar. To cite one relevant parallel, in June 1982 the US-backed Israeli invasion of Lebanon opened with the bombing of the Palestinian refugee camps of Sabra and Shatila, later to become famous as the site of terrible massacres supervised by the IDF (Israeli "Defense" Forces). The bombing hit the local hospital — the Gaza hospital — and killed over 200 people, according to the eyewitness account of an American Middle East academic specialist. The massacre was the opening act in an invasion that slaughtered some 15-20,000 people and destroyed much of southern Lebanon and Beirut, proceeding with crucial US military and diplomatic support. That included vetoes of Security Council resolutions seeking to halt the criminal aggression that was undertaken, as was scarcely concealed, to defend Israel from the threat of peaceful political settlement, contrary to many convenient fabrications about Israelis suffering under intense rocketing, a fantasy of apologists.

Norwegian doctor Mads Gilbert, who unlike Alan Dershowitz, was in Gaza when the Israelis attacked:

described the scene of horror as an "All out war against the civilian population of Gaza." He estimated that half the casualties are women and children. The men are almost all civilians as well, by civilized standards. Gilbert reports that he had scarcely seen a military casualty among the 100s of bodies. The IDF concurs. Hamas "made a point of fighting at a distance — or not at all," Ethan Bronner reports while "parsing the gains" of the US-Israeli assault. So Hamas's manpower remains intact, and it was mostly civilians who suffered pain: a positive outcome, according to widely-held doctrine.

These estimates were confirmed by UN humanitarian chief John Holmes, who informed reporters that it is "a fair presumption" that most of the civilians killed were women and children in a humanitarian crisis that is "worsening day by day as the violence continues." But we could be comforted by the words of Israeli Foreign Minister Tzipi Livni, the leading dove in the current electoral campaign, who assured the world

that there is no "humanitarian crisis" in Gaza, thanks to Israeli benevolence.

Unlike Alan Dershowitz, Israeli officials admit openly that civilians are deliberately targeted. In fact it has always been part of Israel's strategy in dealing with the Palestinians:

All of this is normal, and quite openly discussed by high Israeli officials. Thirty years ago Chief of Staff Mordechai Gur observed that since 1948, "we have been fighting against a population that lives in villages and cities." As Israel's most prominent military analyst, Zeev Schiff, summarized his remarks, "the Israeli Army has always struck civilian populations, purposely and consciously ... the Army, he said, has never distinguished civilian [from military] targets ... [but] purposely attacked civilian targets." The reasons were explained by the distinguished statesman Abba Eban: "there was a rational prospect, ultimately fulfilled, that affected populations would exert pressure for the cessation of hostilities." The effect, as Eban well understood, would be to allow Israel to implement, undisturbed, its programs of illegal expansion and harsh repression. Eban was commenting on a review of Labor government attacks against civilians by Prime Minister Begin, presenting a picture, Eban said, "of an Israel wantonly inflicting every possible measure of death and anguish on civilian populations in a mood reminiscent of regimes which neither Mr. Begin nor I would dare to mention by name." Eban did not contest the facts that Begin reviewed, but criticized him for stating them publicly. Nor did it concern Eban, or his admirers, that his advocacy of massive state terror is also reminiscent of regimes he would not dare to mention by name.

Eban's justification for state terror is regarded as persuasive by respected authorities. As the current US-Israel assault raged, *Times* columnist Thomas Friedman explained that Israel's tactics both in the current attack and in its invasion of Lebanon in 2006 are based on the sound principle of "trying to 'educate' Hamas, by inflicting a heavy death toll on Hamas militants and heavy pain on the Gaza population." That makes sense on pragmatic grounds, as it did in Lebanon, where "the only long-term source of deterrence was to exact enough pain on the civilians — the families and employers of the militants — to restrain Hezbollah in the future." And by similar logic, bin Laden's effort to

"educate" Americans on 9/11 was highly praiseworthy, as were the Nazi attacks on Lidice and Oradour, Putin's destruction of Grozny, and other notable attempts at "education."

Israel has taken pains to make clear its dedication to these guiding principles. NYT correspondent Stephen Erlanger reports that Israeli human rights groups are "troubled by Israel's strikes on buildings they believe should be classified as civilian, like the parliament, police stations and the presidential palace" -- and, we may add, villages, homes, densely populated refugee camps, water and sewage systems, hospitals, schools and universities, mosques, UN relief facilities, ambulances, and indeed anything that might relieve the pain of the unworthy victims. A senior Israeli intelligence officer explained that the IDF attacked "both aspects of Hamas -- its resistance or military wing and its dawa, or social wing," the latter a euphemism for the civilian society. "He argued that Hamas was all of a piece," Erlanger continues, "and in a war, its instruments of political and social control were as legitimate a target as its rocket caches." Erlanger and his editors add no comment about the open advocacy, and practice, of massive terrorism targeting civilians, though correspondents and columnists signal their tolerance or even explicit advocacy of war crimes, as noted. But keeping to the norm, Erlanger does not fail to stress that Hamas rocketing is "an obvious violation of the principle of discrimination and fits the classic definition of terrorism."

Like others familiar with the region, Middle East specialist Fawwaz Gerges observes that "What Israeli officials and their American allies do not appreciate is that Hamas is not merely an armed militia but a social movement with a large popular base that is deeply entrenched in society." Hence when they carry out their plans to destroy Hamas's "social wing," they are aiming to destroy Palestinian society.

Gerges may be too kind. It is highly unlikely that Israeli and American officials -- or the media and other commentators -- do not appreciate these facts. Rather, they implicitly adopt the traditional perspective of those who monopolize means of violence: our mailed fist can crush any opposition, and if our furious assault has a heavy civilian toll, that's all to the good: perhaps the remnants will be properly

educated.

IDF officers clearly understand that they are crushing the civilian society. Ethan Bronner quotes an Israeli Colonel who says that he and his men are not much "impressed with the Hamas fighters." "They are villagers with guns," said a gunner on an armored personnel carrier. They resemble the victims of the murderous IDF "iron fist" operations in occupied southern Lebanon in 1985, directed by Shimon Peres, one of the great terrorist commanders of the era of Reagan's "War on Terror." During these operations, Israeli commanders and strategic analysts explained that the victims were "terrorist villagers," difficult to eradicate because "these terrorists operate with the support of most of the local population." An Israeli commander complained that "the terrorist ... has many eyes here, because he lives here," while the military correspondent of the *Jerusalem Post* described the problems Israeli forces faced in combating the "terrorist mercenary," "fanatics, all of whom are sufficiently dedicated to their causes to go on running the risk of being killed while operating against the IDF," which must "maintain order and security" in occupied southern Lebanon despite "the price the inhabitants will have to pay." The problem has been familiar to Americans in South Vietnam, Russians in Afghanistan, Germans in occupied Europe, and other aggressors that find themselves implementing the Gur-Eban-Friedman doctrine.

Norman Finkelstein makes the same point, in a well-documented article:

The operative plan for the Gaza bloodbath can be gleaned from authoritative statements after the war got underway: "What we have to do is act systematically with the aim of punishing all the organizations that are firing the rockets and mortars, as well as the civilians who are enabling them to fire and hide" (reserve Major-General); "After this operation there will not be one Hamas building left standing in Gaza" (Deputy IDF Chief of Staff); "Anything affiliated with Hamas is a legitimate target" (IDF Spokesperson's Office). Whereas Israel killed a mere 55 Lebanese during the first two days of the 2006 war, the Israeli media exulted at Israel's "shock and awe" (Maariv) as it killed more than 300 Palestinians in the first two days of the attack on Gaza. Several days into the slaughter an informed Israeli strategic analyst observed, "The

IDF, which planned to attack buildings and sites populated by hundreds of people, did not warn them in advance to leave, but intended to kill a great many of them, and succeeded." Morris could barely contain his pride at "Israel's highly efficient air assault on Hamas." The Israeli columnist B. Michael was less impressed by the dispatch of helicopter gunships and jet planes "over a giant prison and firing at its people" -- for example, "70 ... traffic cops at their graduation ceremony, young men in desperate search of a livelihood who thought they'd found it in the police and instead found death from the skies."

As Israel targeted schools, mosques, hospitals, ambulances, and U.N. sanctuaries, as it slaughtered and incinerated Gaza's defenseless civilian population (one-third of the 1,200 reported casualties were children), Israeli commentators gloated that "Gaza is to Lebanon as the second sitting for an exam is to the first -- a second chance to get it right," and that this time around Israel had "hurled [Gaza] back," not 20 years as it promised to do in Lebanon, but "into the 1940s. Electricity is available only for a few hours a day"; that "Israel regained its deterrence capabilities" because "the war in Gaza has compensated for the shortcomings of the [2006] Second Lebanon War"; and that "There is no doubt that Hezbollah leader Hassan Nasrallah is upset these days. ...There will no longer be anyone in the Arab world who can claim that Israel is weak." (<http://www.normanfinkelstein.com/article.php?pg=11&ar=2542>)

Israel's "all out war against the civilian population of Gaza" included, Chomsky reminds us, the use of white phosphorus in the shelling of a hospital and a United Nations food warehouse in Gaza City:

The shelling destroyed "hundreds of tons of emergency food and medicines set for distribution today to shelters, hospitals and feeding centres," according to UNRWA director John Ging. Military strikes at the same time destroyed two floors of the al-Quds hospital, setting it ablaze, and also a second warehouse run by the Palestinian Red Crescent society. The hospital in the densely-populated Tal-Hawa neighbourhood was destroyed by Israeli tanks "after hundreds of frightened Gazans had taken shelter inside as Israeli ground forces pushed into the neighbourhood," AP reported.

There was nothing left to salvage inside the smoldering ruins of the hospital. "They shelled the building, the hospital building. It caught fire. We tried to evacuate the sick people and the injured and the people who were there. Firefighters arrived and put out the fire, which burst into flames again and they put it out again and it came back for the third time," paramedic Ahmad Al-Haz told *AP*. It was suspected that the blaze might have been set by white phosphorous, also suspected in numerous other fires and serious burn injuries.

The suspicions were confirmed by Amnesty International after the cessation of the intense bombardment made inquiry possible. Before, Israel had sensibly barred all journalists, even Israeli, while its crimes were proceeding in full fury. Israel's use of white phosphorus against Gaza civilians is "clear and undeniable," AI reported. Its repeated use in densely populated civilian areas "is a war crime," AI concluded. They found white phosphorus edges scattered around residential buildings, still burning, "further endangering the residents and their property," particularly children "drawn to the detritus of war and often unaware of the danger." Primary targets, they report, were the UNRWA compound, where the Israeli "white phosphorus landed next to some fuel trucks and caused a large fire which destroyed tons of humanitarian aid" after Israeli authorities "had given assurance that no further strikes would be launched on the compound." On the same day, "a white phosphorus shell landed in the al-Quds hospital in Gaza City also causing a fire which forced hospital staff to evacuate the patients. ... White phosphorus landing on skin can burn deep through muscle and into the bone, continuing to burn unless deprived of oxygen." Purposely intended or beyond depraved indifference, such crimes are inevitable when this weapon is used in attacks on civilians.

The fact that Israeli troops used white phosphorus on civilians in Gaza was not mentioned as part of the Williamson affair (although Alan Dershowitz did drag both Bishop Williamson and Cardinal Martino into his discussion of Gaza) because what people like Alan Dershowitz engage in is an acceptable form of "holocaust denial." Catholic bishops are not permitted to question any aspect of the holocaust narrative, but Jewish law professors and Israeli rabbis are allowed to advocate genocide with impunity. They are allowed to engage in the worst form of "holocaust denial," denial of the

holocaust as it is actually happening in places like Gaza. At the risk of having Alan Dershowitz call us anti-Semitic, let's compare Bishop Williamson's comments and the outrage they generated with the silence surrounding the statement of Israeli rabbis who previously urged the IDF to commit war crimes and genocide in Gaza. From a public relations perspective there is no basis for comparison because Rabbinic holocaust denial went unmentioned in the press accounts of the Israeli attack on Gaza. As Noam Chomsky points out:

The ravings of the political and military leaders are mild as compared to the preaching of rabbinical authorities. They are not marginal figures. On the contrary, they are highly influential in the army and in the settler movement, who Zertal and Eldar reveal to be "lords of the land," with enormous impact on policy. Soldiers fighting in northern Gaza were afforded an "inspirational" visit from two leading rabbis, who explained to them that there are no "innocents" in Gaza, so everyone there is a legitimate target, quoting a famous passage from Psalms calling on the Lord to seize the infants of Israel's oppressors and dash them against the rocks. The rabbis were breaking no new ground. A year earlier, the former chief Sephardic rabbi wrote to Prime Minister Olmert, informing him that all civilians in Gaza are collectively guilty for rocket attacks, so that there is "absolutely no moral prohibition against the indiscriminate killing of civilians during a potential massive military offensive on Gaza aimed at stopping the rocket launchings," as the *Jerusalem Post* reported his ruling. His son, chief rabbi of Safed, elaborated: "If they don't stop after we kill 100, then we must kill a thousand, and if they do not stop after 1,000 then we must kill 10,000. If they still don't stop we must kill 100,000, even a million. Whatever it takes to make them stop."

Just as a combination thought experiment and reality check, try to imagine a Catholic bishop making a statement like the one you just read. If you find this hard to imagine, you need to ask a few questions. Why is there outrage when a Catholic bishop raises theoretical historical questions about a war 60 years in the past, but not even a peep of reproach when a rabbi advocates the murder of 1,000, 10,000, 100,000, or even a million Palestinians? Why is the Church silent in the face of this holocaust? Who is the real holocaust denier? Bishop Williamson or Alan Dershowitz?

Thought Experiment

Let's continue our thought experiment by considering the following allegory. Suppose a German were elected pope. Suppose the Papal States still had an army, as they did during the Middle Ages. Suppose that after ascending the throne of Peter, the German pope began bringing Germans to live with him in the Vatican. After a few months it was becoming clear that the Germans who had come to live at the Vatican at the pope's invitation were now running out of room or, to use the German term, "*Lebensraum*." As a result the Germans began moving into adjacent neighborhoods driving the Romans from their homes, killing anyone who resisted, and stealing their property. Whole sections of Rome were ethnically cleansed and the Italians whose property was confiscated by the Germans were rounded up and put in refugee or concentration camps, where they were slowly starved to death by being deprived of food, electricity and water.

Whenever the displaced Romans complained too loudly, the German pope would send in his fleet of helicopter gunships and destroy their hospitals, schools, and other public buildings, especially when the terrorized civilian population would gather there to escape the bombing. The pope's aircraft, supplied by Germany, would also drop white phosphorus bombs on UN warehouses containing food for the starving civilian population. Just before the pope launched this campaign of genocide on the ethnically cleansed Italians, he ordered all of the world's bishops to denounce anyone who protested as "anti-Catholic." The bishops also told the pope's troops that they should have no qualms about killing innocent women and children because Italians were racially inferior and because the Italian Liberation Organization used them as human shields anyway.

Can anyone seriously imagine world opinion tolerating such a situation? If not, how is it that world opinion, including the Catholic Church, tolerates what I have described above when Israelis do it to Palestinians? Doesn't the silence over what is happening in Gaza amount to a much more serious form of "holocaust denial" than anything connected even remotely to what Bishop Williamson said?

"Similar views," Chomsky continues,

are expressed by prominent American secular figures. When Israel invaded Lebanon in 2006, Harvard Law School Professor Alan

Dershowitz explained in the liberal online journal Huffington Post that all Lebanese are legitimate targets of Israeli violence. Lebanon's citizens are "paying the price" for supporting "terrorism" — that is, for supporting resistance to Israel's invasion. Accordingly, Lebanese civilians are no more immune to attack than Austrians who supported the Nazis. The fatwa of the Sephardic rabbi applies to them. In a video on the *Jerusalem Post* website, Dershowitz went on to ridicule talk of excessive kill ratios of Palestinians to Israelis: it should be increased to 1000-to-one, he said, or even 1000-to-zero, meaning the brutes should be completely exterminated. Of course, he is referring to "terrorists," a broad category that includes the victims of Israeli power, since "Israel never targets civilians," he emphatically declared. It follows that Palestinians, Lebanese, Tunisians, in fact anyone who gets in the way of the ruthless armies of the Holy State is a terrorist, or an accidental victim of their just crimes.

The claim that "our side" never targets civilians is familiar doctrine among those who monopolize the means of violence. And there is some truth to it. We do not generally try to kill particular civilians. Rather, we carry out murderous actions that we know will slaughter many civilians, but without specific intent to kill particular ones. In law, the routine practices might fall under the category of depraved indifference, but that is not an adequate designation for standard imperial practice and doctrine. It is more similar to walking down a street knowing that we might kill ants, but without intent to do so, because they rank so low that it just doesn't matter. The same is true when Israel carries out actions that it knows will kill the "grasshoppers" and "two-legged beasts" who happen to infest the lands it "liberates." There is no good term for this form of moral depravity, arguably worse than deliberate murder, and all too familiar.

Just as *l'affaire* Williamson was dying down, Caesar entered the fray to stir things up again. On January 31, 2009, 50 Catholic politicians wrote to the pope demanding that "you publicly state your unequivocal position on this matter so that it is clear where the Church stands on one of the most consequential events of the 20th century. To neglect to do so is to allow others to portray it as they wish and impede the progress made over so many years toward harmony and reconciliation." The same officials who had grown

accustomed to invoking the separation of church and state every time a bishop asked them to vote against abortion, now had no qualms about interfering, *qua* state officials, in the internal workings of the Catholic Church.

By February 2, the Vatican had regained its composure somewhat, and Press Secretary Lombardi had returned to reiterating the Church's initial response, namely, that lifting the excommunication and holocaust denial were two separate issues. But it was only the lull before the next storm, which broke on February 3, when Angela Merkel, Germany's prime minister, turned *l'affaire* Williamson into a Church-State issue by calling on the pope to "clarify the situation." Admitting that she was meddling in the internal affairs of the Church, Merkel plunged forward anyway by claiming that the gravity of the situation demanded it. "The situation is different because we're dealing with fundamental issues," is how she put it.

"This should not be allowed to pass without consequences," Frau Merkel said at a news conference in Berlin. "This is not just a matter, in my opinion, for the Christian, Catholic and Jewish communities in Germany but the Pope and the Vatican should clarify unambiguously that there can be no [holocaust] denial," she said. "In my opinion, this isn't just an issue affecting the Christian, Catholic and Jewish communities in Germany," Merkel said on Tuesday, February 3. Rather, it is important that the pope clarify "that Holocaust denial cannot be accepted and that, in general, there must be a positive association with Judaism as a whole." She went on to say: "I do not believe that sufficient clarification has been made."

By February 3, it was clear that the German bishops had turned on the pope. Cardinal Lehmann who battled with Pope John Paul II over the German church's approval of abortion counseling at Catholic facilities sided publicly with Merkel. German Catholics were caught up in the lynch mob mentality being orchestrated by *Der Spiegel* and Hans Kueng. Many Catholics were appalled at Merkel's interference in what even she admitted were the internal affairs of the Church, but any Catholic voice not caught up in the lynch mob mentality was simply eliminated from the harangue against the pope that all of the major media outlets were orchestrating.

The German rabbis weren't helping matters any. Michel Friedman, former vice-president of the Central Council of German Jews, took the 50-year-old tradition of Catholic-Jewish dialogue to new heights when he went on the "Maintower" program on Hessian Radio Network and called the pope

"a liar and a hypocrite." Just think what Friedman might have called the pope without the soothing benefit of *Nostra Aetate*! And why was the pope a hypocrite? Because he claimed to take a stand against "every anti-Semite in the world and every holocaust denier" when in fact, "in the middle of the Vatican he accepts them with open arms."

"Only the excommunication of this anti-Semitic bigot can restore the pope's credibility," Friedman concluded.
(<http://www.stern.de/panorama/:Michel-Friedman-Der-Papst-L%C3%9Cgner-Heuchler/653817.html>)

With "dialogue" like this, who needed religious wars? Intemperate language like this was beginning to cause a reaction. As one German commentator put it, "the latest media campaign did nothing but widen the chasm separating published opinion and the German people. With each new campaign politics and media lost their last shred of credibility. When Die Welt commissioned an on-line poll asking "How do you judge the work of Pope Benedict XVI?" the overwhelming majority (*i.e.*, 64 percent of the 25,000 people taking part in the poll), answered, "Very good. He draws clear lines and does everything right." People commenting in on-line forums were massively censored or deleted or not allowed to answer this question.

Conspiracy Nut

Anyone who hinted that the media were orchestrating this outcry was denounced as a conspiracy nut, as when *Spiegel* claimed that "The Vatican is now blaming the incident on a conspiracy to harm the Catholic Church leader."

German Jews, on the other hand, were predictably effusive in their praise of Angela Merkel. "(We have) deep respect and appreciation for the chancellor for the fact that she spoke out on this difficult matter," Stephan Kramer, general secretary of the Central Council of Jews in Germany, told the *Westdeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*. It shows "the kind of prudence and feeling of responsibility she has," he said. "Kramer's remarks," *Spiegel* continued

were echoed by Elan Steinberg, vice president of the American Gathering of Jewish Holocaust Survivors and their Descendants. "When the German chancellor admonishes a German-born pope, it is an extraordinary message," Steinberg wrote in an e-mail to the Associated Press. "Together with the expressions of outrage emanating from German and Austrian bishops, these developments have ironically strengthened relations between Germany and the world Jewish community."

Comments like this, however, only strengthened the feeling among rank and file German Catholics that the Jews had bribed Merkel to intervene in what she clearly felt was an intra-Catholic issue with a potentially large political downside for her if it backfired.

On February 4, in response to Merkel's call for "*Klarstellung*" the Vatican issued a statement claiming that Bishop Williamson would have to deny "Holocaust denial" before he could be readmitted to the Church as a bishop in good standing. Under the heading, "Declarations on the Shoah," the Vatican Secretary of State announced that

The positions of Mons. Williamson on the Shoah are absolutely unacceptable and firmly rejected by the Holy Father, as he himself remarked on the past January 28, when, referring to that brutal genocide, he reaffirmed his full and unquestionable solidarity with our Brethren, receivers of the First Covenant, and affirmed that the memory of that

terrible genocide must lead "mankind to reflect on the unpredictable power of evil when it conquers the heart of man", adding that the Shoah remains "for all a warning against forgetfulness, against denial or reductionism, because the violence against a single human being is violence against all."

Bishop Williamson, for an admission to episcopal functions in the Church, will also have to distance himself, in an absolutely unequivocal and public manner, from his positions regarding the Shoah, unknown to the Holy Father in the moment of the remission of the excommunication.

Jewish reaction to the announcement was predictable. "This was the sign the Jewish world has been waiting for," said Ronald Lauder, president of the World Jewish Congress.

In making the announcement, Rome pleaded for prayers and support for the pope as the "Custodian of Unity" in the Church, and well it might because requiring Bishop Williamson to deny "Holocaust denial" had the potential for being the biggest public relations disaster of the entire Williamson affair, if for no other reason than the number of people it affected. In attempting to restore unity to the Church, the pope had enraged the Jews. Now in attempting to placate the Jews, the pope ran the risk of alienating over one billion rank and file Catholics by giving them the impression that the Holocaust narrative was now an article of faith. Michael Hoffman II, author of *Judaism Discovered*, made similar claims in an e-mail he sent to the pope:

Is the rabbinic "Shoah" mysticism now a dogma of the Roman Catholic Church? . . . Do Catholics no longer have the right to doubt or question aspects of secular history? Does the Magisterium [*sic*] of the Church now decree the undoubted veracity of the figure of Six Million deceased Judaic persons, and the undoubted existence of a mass killing operation in Auschwitz-Birkenau, conducted by means of poison gas chambers?

Are you aware of the extent to which the Crucifixion of Christ has been replaced by Auschwitz as the central ontological event of western history? Do you wish to be complicit in the disastrous effects that continue to accrue from this derogation of Jesus and deification of man?

One anonymous commentator on the web made much the same point

when he claimed that:

In the past, a dogma referred only to a matter of Christian faith, and Catholics could believe whatever they wanted about historical events. But today's remarks from the Vatican make it clear that the Jewish version of the Holocaust, in which 6 million Jews were killed in gas chambers, must be believed by every Catholic or they're not in communion with the Church. That makes the Holocaust an official dogma of the Catholic Faith.

Administrative Decision

The situation, however, was neither that bad nor that simple. Theologian Raymond Kevane claims that it is impossible to globalize from what is essentially an administrative decision by the pope.

What the Pope did was to make a priestly and administrative decision which related precisely and only to those four bishops: absolve them from their censures, and then reprimand the one for making an unfortunate public statement. The Pope was making no theological or doctrinal statement. I believe the Pope's overall purpose was obscured by the stupidity of one of the bishops the Pope was being kind to: It appears to me that he wants to reinstate in some fashion the liturgy of an earlier time which has been lost.

As Robert Sungenis, the theologian whose article in *Culture Wars* got the American bishops to remove their statement that the Mosaic covenant was "eternally valid" from their catechism, put it:

The pope is not insisting on a recanting of his 'holocaust denial' as a requirement to being readmitted to the Church, but only as a requirement for having his canonical function as a bishop restored, or what the Vatican called his being 'reinstated to episcopal service.'

Canonically, the pope does have the authority to bind Williamson in this way, since according to Vatican I, the pope's disciplinary powers over his clerics are unlimited and no one can question them. So, right or wrong on insisting Williamson recant his position, the pope has the right to enact disciplinary measures against Williamson.

Sungenis feels that the Vatican, by placing this requirement on Williamson, "has put itself in a win-win situation," because "it knows that Williamson is probably not going to recant, so he can then be used as the scapegoat. All the blame for whatever is bad about traditionalist extremism will be heaped on Williamson, and then Fellay and the other three bishops will be eventually re-commissioned under the good grace of both the Catholic Church and the Jews."

On the other hand, "if Williamson does recant, the pope still wins, only more dramatically, since now the SSPX has fully submitted to his power (and

the Jews are happy that the pope has submitted to their power)."

The only lagging, yet supremely important issue remaining regards the ethical validity of the pope's insistence that Williamson recant his opinion without a canonical trial to see if his opinion is, indeed, worthy of its claims. Since Williams is being accused of being 'anti-Semitic' for denying a so-called 'fact of history' about the Semites, and since 'anti-Semitism' is a mortal sin in the Catholic Church, then a trial is the only recourse for determining if, indeed, Williamson is guilty of 'anti-Semitism,' for that could be the only grounds upon which he could be formally disciplined by the pope.

Sungenis went on to say that any "canonical trial to determine whether Williamson is guilty of anti-Semitism" would "require a legal investigation of whether there were indeed, six million Jews gassed by the Nazis. This puts the burden on the Vatican to prove their case in open court, and severely curtails the Jewish court of public opinion that is now running the show."

So, in terms of actual theological fact, no, the holocaust has not been declared a dogma of the Church. But in terms of perception, the Catholic faithful once more learn that their concerns take a back seat to the feelings of the Jews. In terms of perception, it certainly looked as if the pope caved in to the demands of the emperor and the Jews who were egging her on.

The pope's capitulation to Merkel's demands raised all sorts of historical parallels. Now it was the pope and not Barbarossa, the German Emperor, who had to stand barefoot in the snow at Canossa. This time it was a woman and not Napoleon who slapped the pope in the face. What Marx referred to as "the cunning of history" was far from exhausted by these two examples.

Sandro Magister, the Italian George Weigel, showed his neocon sympathies when he raised Vatican II to the level of the creed. But in doing so, Magister, in an equally neocon way, raised an issue with uncanny historical ramifications, namely, the issue of the pope's "silence."

For some, it was easy to throw into the faces of the Vatican authorities their excessive silence on another, much more dangerous form of denial of the Holocaust, the one publicly supported by the leaders of Iran. In the almost four years of his pontificate, in effect, only once has an official Vatican document condemned, in vague words, Iran's intention of wiping Israel from the face of the earth.

Pope Benedict is now doing exactly what the Jews accused Pius XII of doing. The Jews allege that Pius XII capitulated to the German Chancellor, which is precisely what Benedict did when faced with Merkel's threat. The Jews claim that Pius XII was silent when he should have denounced the holocaust, which is precisely what happened during the final two weeks of December 2008. The near total silence emanating from Rome at the time of the Israeli war crimes against the Palestinians in Gaza during the last two weeks of 2008 was positively deafening.

By February 10, it looked as if the chain of events was going to prove Sungenis right. Bishop Williamson was being made the scapegoat. After telling *Spiegel* that he planned to reconsider his views on the Holocaust -- a process that would "take time," Williamson claimed -- Fellay ordered the Rev. Christian Bouchacourt, director of the Latin American branch of the SSPX, to fire Williamson from his job as rector of the SSPX seminary in La Reja, Argentina. Bouchacourt claimed that Williamson's views "in no way reflect the position of our congregation" and that by expressing them, Williamson had "discredited" the SSPX.

With Williamson out of the way, Catholic-Jewish dialogue could resume. That meant that the pope could once again talk to people like Rabbi Shmuley Boteach, who weighed with his own contribution to dialogue by writing an article in the *Jerusalem Post* entitled: "The Pope Must Condemn the Jew-haters in the Church." Boteach, who, like every other rabbi, is an expert in Catholic theology, applauded Angela Merkel, who "is reaching out to a pope to teach him morality." Unfortunately, the pope is a slow learner; "he has yet to simply kick the bishop back to where he belongs -- a state of excommunication from the Catholic Church." So -- pace, Dr. Sungenis -- Holocaust denial is an excommunicable offense after all. It must be true, if Rabbi Shmuley says so.

What follows is Boteach's character assassination of Pius XII, whom the rabbi refers to as "Hitler's pope." As an example of Pius XII's heinous crimes, Boteach mentions the fact that he actually "granted a secret audience to Supreme SS Polizeiführer Karl Wolff." As we all know from reading the parable of the Good Samaritan, rabbis like Boteach consider people like Wolff ritually unclean. Just being in the same room with a "Supreme SS Polizeiführer" is enough to bring about moral contamination, something Rabbi Shmuley alludes to when he says, "That Pius realized he was doing something that others would regard as immoral is attested to by the fact that

the meeting took place in great secrecy and Wolff came dressed in disguise." Are we to imagine Pius XII calling Wolff on the phone and telling him to come in disguise? Or are there other more plausible explanations here? Whatever. Rabbis have the charism of infallibility when it comes to reading other people's minds, especially the minds of dead popes. But not content to leave it at that, Rabbi Shmuley feels compelled to come up with the smoking gun in the Pius XII case. The pope, according to Boteach condemns himself with his own words, or at least the words of Karl Wolff: "Years later," Boteach writes, "Wolff had this to say about the meeting: 'From the pope's own words I could sense the sincerity of his sympathy and how much he loved the German people.'" At this point we can imagine Rabbi Boteach rending his garments and crying out, "You have heard the blasphemy. Pius XII said that he loved the German people! What need of witnesses have we now!" If Pope Benedict wants to know what God thinks of Catholic-Jewish dialogue, we recommend a reading of St. Matthew's account of the Passion and Death of our Savior, in particular 26: 57-68.

As a further indication of what the pope can learn by engaging in dialogue with people like Rabbi Shmuley, we read:

The Catholic Church has come a long, long way from its anti-Semitic past. This was done primarily through the courage of three of the four most recent popes, great men all, beginning with John XXIII, continuing with John Paul II and culminating in the warm friendship offered to the Jewish community by Pope Benedict. So why would the pope undermine the warm and outstretched hand he has offered the Jewish community by demanding that the sins of his predecessor, the unrighteous Pius XII, be expunged by his victims?"

Why, indeed?! At this point more important questions arise, namely, why would anyone, much less the pope, want to talk to an ignorant bigot like Shmuley Boteach? Doesn't the pope have better things to do with his time? Perhaps as a first step in re-starting Catholic-Jewish dialogue, the pope can appoint a commission to untangle Rabbi Shmuley's Talmudic syntax. Then, they can move on to deciphering his mixed metaphors. Why is the pope undermining the warm and outstretched hand he has offered the Jewish community? This is Boteach at his irenic best! If this is the way rabbis engage in dialogue with the pope, we can imagine how they talk in private. And that, of course, raises the real issue, namely, why does the pope want to

talk to people like this? Haven't we had enough of this already? With dialogue like this, who needs logomachy?

And with these questions still unanswered, we come to the heart of the Williamson affair. The lesson of the last 50 years of dialogue is now clear: the Church can have unity or she can have good relations with the Jews, but she can't have both. The two options are mutually exclusive. The more the pope talks with the Jews, the more he destroys the unity of the Church; the more the pope attempts to restore unity, as in his lifting of the excommunication of the four bishops, the more he enrages the Jews.

Non datur tertius

We continue to witness one of the greatest course corrections in the history of the Church. The post-Vatican II era of covert Jewish warfare under the name of irenic dialogue is over. The warfare is out in the open now. Dragging Vatican II into this discussion is a red herring. *Nostra Aetate* was not heretical, but by now it should be obvious that the project of Catholic-Jewish relations based on NA can't be construed as anything other than a failed experiment. It failed because Rome took as its model Jew Nathan der Weise and not God's verdict as expressed in I Thess 2: 15.

In spite of all of the missteps of the Williamson affair, the Church is slowly regaining its footing and its willingness to articulate its traditional position against the people that St. Paul referred to as enemies of all mankind. If we need empirical evidence that the Jews are "the enemies of the whole human race," footage of the carnage in Gaza should suffice to convince even the most skeptical Philosemite that rejection of Logos has terrible consequences. St. Paul's statement is as relevant today when we were forced to stand by helplessly and watch the slaughter of 1,300 Palestinians at the hands of the Israelis as it was when St. Paul first wrote those words. The irony of the past 50 years of Catholic-Jewish dialogue is that it has placed the current pope in precisely the situation the Jews have falsely attributed to Pope Pius XII. When Cardinal Martino referred to Gaza as a concentration camp, his remarks sparked outrage among the Jews. His comment, however, only points up the silence of the Church on the ongoing Palestinian genocide in Gaza.

The Lefebvrite schism has hurt the church, but it has hurt the Lefbvrites even more. Like all schisms it was based on lack of charity, which Catholics consider the worst sin. As St. Paul says (I Cor 13: 1), "If I have all the eloquence of men or of angels, but speak without love am simply a gong booming or a cymbal clashing. . . . If I give away all that I possess, piece by piece, and if I even let them take my body to burn it, but am without love, it will do me no good whatsoever."

Reunion, as the pope pointed out in the letter that set off *l'affaire* Williamson, means the triumph of charity. Reunion, as Bishop Fellay points out, also means a rehabilitation of tradition. Reunion means that the Church regains her strength. All of this has consequences for the Jews. When the Church is strong, the Jews are weak. The Middle Ages are evidence of that.

When the Church is weak, the Jews are strong. The last 50 years are certainly evidence of that. The Jews don't want this wound to be healed for obvious reasons. But as Henry V said after the French embassy had gone back to their lines to prepare for an attack, "Our lives are in God's hands, not theirs."

Chapter Two: Holocaust Denial and Thought Control and Deborah Lipstadt

On March 25, 2009, Notre Dame was embroiled in the biggest controversy to hit the campus since the performance of *The Vagina Monologues*. A few days earlier, Notre Dame president John Jenkins, CSC had announced that the university planned to give President Barack Obama an honorary doctorate. Within hours of the announcement a storm of protest erupted which showed no sign of dying down any time soon. Citing the statement of the US Catholic Bishops in 2004 -- "The Catholic community and Catholic institutions should not honor those who act in defiance of our fundamental moral principles. They should not be given awards, honors or platforms which would suggest support for their actions" -- the ordinary of the Diocese of Fort Wayne-South Bend, John M. D'Arcy announced that, for the first time in 25 years, he would not be attending graduation ceremonies at Notre Dame, because "President Obama has recently affirmed, and has now placed in public policy, his long stated unwillingness to hold human life as sacred."

By March 25, 2009 over 100,000 people had signed a petition condemning Notre Dame's actions, and Bishop Thomas J. Olmstead of the Phoenix, Arizona diocese joined with his colleague Bishop D'Arcy in denouncing Jenkins' decision, calling the decision to honor President Obama a "public act of disobedience" and a "grave mistake."

Instead of addressing the running sore that is the Catholic identity issue at Notre Dame, the provost of that institution along with the Notre Dame Holocaust Project invited a "renowned historian" to address the issue of "holocaust denial," a delict which has succeeded patriotism as the last refuge of scoundrels. The "renowned historian" in question was Deborah Lipstadt, who, according to the press release sent out weeks in advance, is the director of the Rabbi Donald A. Tam Institute for Jewish Studies and is currently on leave of absence at the Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies at the Holocaust Museum in Washington DC.

The invitation was hastily extended in the wake of what has come to be known as the Williamson Affair. In hosting the affair, Notre Dame could establish its academic bona fides by inviting a Jew in to beat up a Catholic

bishop. Needless to say, I wanted to get to the lecture early so that I could get a seat. Expecting a ropes-up crowd, I was disappointed to find a sparsely attended hall. In fact, if it weren't for a busload of middle-aged Jewish ladies brought in from the south side of town, the hall would have been virtually empty. Lipstadt was introduced by a chubby middle-aged man who looked like a professor (he wasn't wearing a tie), but it was hard to tell whether he was Catholic or Jewish, a state of affairs that is also applicable to Notre Dame as an institution. Both Professor Lipstadt and the man who introduced her kept referring to Bishop Williamson as the "alleged" Bishop Williamson, showing their ignorance of both the English language and Catholic theology. Bishop Williamson was consecrated a bishop in 1988 by Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre. His consecration was valid but not licit because it was done in defiance of Rome. For that act, the six bishops involved were excommunicated *latae sententiae*. It was Pope Benedict's lifting of the excommunications which set off what has come to be known as the Williamson affair.

As further evidence of her renown, Professor Lipstadt's introducer told us that Professor Lipstadt "discussed alleged Bishop Williamson's holocaust denial on her blog," and that this blogging "may have helped the Vatican see the light." After informing the pope that he "must unequivocally distance himself from [alleged Bishops Williamson's] views, Professor Lipstadt concluded, again on her blog, that "I think [the pope] was willing to tolerate these views in the name of unity."

Given the nature of Catholic response to the Williamson affair, one would think that Professor Lipstadt would have been pleased, but this was not the case. In one of the most groveling responses to the Williamson affair, Roger Cardinal Mahony, archbishop of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, barred Bishop Williamson from setting foot in any Catholic building in the archdiocese. Again, one would think that Professor Lipstadt would be pleased by an action like this, but that was not the case. In a comment which, according to her blog, she posted at 4:42 AM [!] March 2, 2009, Lipstadt dismissed Mahony's gesture as "largely symbolic in that Williamson has not given any sign that LA was on his travel itinerary." If Cardinal Mahony thought an attack on a fellow Catholic bishop would ingratiate him with the likes of Professor Lipstadt, he obviously had not reckoned with Professor Lipstadt's high standards. "What I found jarring," she continued, "was the statement by the spokesman for the archdiocese. 'The cardinal wished to send

a clear signal to the Jewish community that Williamson is not a member or even welcome in the Catholic Church until he renounces his views'."

"This," Lipstadt sniffed indignantly,

should not be a message to the Jewish Community but to all people who think truth is important--irrespective of their faith. It would be a message that people who lie about history, distort the truth, express anti-Semitic and racist views, and pervert facts in order to defend one of the most diabolical regimes in history are not welcome in the LA archdiocese. Racists, for example, should be shunned not to send a message to minority communities but because racists spread hatred, instill contempt, and work against communal tranquility.

I don't mean to quibble over this strong statement on Cardinal Mahony's part. But to do this and define it as a message to the 'victims' is to miss the point.

That being said, she was nonetheless pleased with her two-day stay at Notre Dame, which she described as "an institution which takes its Catholic identity seriously."

Before too long into the introduction, it became clear that Professor Lipstadt established her credentials as a "renowned historian," by writing "three books," two of which bear variations on the title "Denying the Holocaust." Not content with her own unearned laurels, Lipstadt is obsessed with denying the qualifications which others have earned honestly. In a letter on her blog which she sent to the *New York Times*, Lipstadt takes issue with the *Times* referring to David Irving, who has written more than three books, as a "historian." Instead of referring to Irving as a "historian," the *Times* should have called him a "denier."

Her three books notwithstanding, Lipstadt's real claim to fame came from the fact that she was named as a defendant in a libel suit, something that the Notre Dame press release pointed out. A book on that trial constitutes one-third of all of her book-length writing over the past 23 years. As some indication of the depth of her overall scholarship, Lipstadt assigned the "Holocaust memoir" called *Fragments* in her classes. When the book was revealed as a threadbare hoax written by a non-Jew who had never been near a concentration camp, Lipstadt opined that, if the allegation turned out to be true (which it did), this "might complicate matters somewhat," but insisted that it would still be "powerful as a novel."

Professor Lipstadt was supposed to have been introduced by Rabbi Michael Signer. This is fitting in a way because Signer was also the recipient of an endowed chair, he at Notre Dame, for producing even less intellectual material than Professor Lipstadt. Rabbi Signer could not attend the lecture because he died in January but Professor Lipstadt assured her audience that he is now "up there watching us."

Even more than being a defendant in a libel suit, Professor Lipstadt's renown comes from her efforts to prevent the spread of the delict known as "holocaust denial." The point of her talk at Notre Dame was explaining the full ramifications of this invention. As we have come to expect from speakers like this, Professor Lipstadt feels that another *Kristalnacht* is right around the corner. "I see things," she confided to the yentas from the south side, "as bleaker than I used to see them." Over the past year, there has been "an uptick in anti-Semitism," something that should be "a source of tremendous concern."

Of course, given her expansive notion of anti-Semitism -- "Holocaust denial is a form of anti-Semitism"; it is "the new anti-Semitism" -- "uptick" is hardly the proper term. The Holocaust itself begins to pale in comparison to the threats now on the horizon -- not that I am accusing Professor Lipstadt of Holocaust denial. According to Professor Lipstadt's definition of the term, anyone who says the word apartheid and Israel in the same sentence is guilty of the "new anti-Semitism." The term "Israel Apartheid" was, of course, a veiled reference to former President Jimmy Carter, who is now routinely dismissed as an anti-Semite. Perhaps "New Anti-Semite" might be a better term, since it corresponds with the "New Anti-Semitism" and reflects, of course, the fact that no Jew dared to level the term when Carter was president.

At this point, Professor Lipstadt was just warming to her topic. Any claim, she continued, that Zionism is a form of racism or anything linking Israel and South Africa also constitutes anti-Semitism. The same goes for UN resolutions condemning Israeli behavior toward Palestinians, something she terms "legalized anti-Semitism." The same goes for people who refer to Jews as a group, as in what she terms "the so-called Jewish lobby," which was a veiled reference to Walt and Mearsheimer's book on the Israel Lobby. Anti-Semitism has even infected "some parts of Belgium"!

Which brings us to the heart of the "new anti-Semitism," otherwise known as Holocaust denial. There are two forms of Holocaust denial: Hard

core and soft-core. As examples of hard-core holocaust denial, Lipstadt mentioned David Irving and "so-called Bishop Williamson." Lipstadt also objects to historians who claim that "otherwise David Irving is a good historian," making it clear that they are guilty of what might be termed second-hand Holocaust denial, a pathogen that is contracted by intellectual proximity in analogous fashion to how lung cancer is supposedly contracted by second-hand smoke.

Then there is soft-core Holocaust denial. As examples thereof, Lipstadt listed things like "cancellation of Holocaust remembrance day celebrations," something that happened in Barcelona recently, "because of Israeli behavior in Gaza." As another example of soft-core holocaust denial, Lipstadt mentioned "Eastern European countries governments arguing that Nazis and Communists were equivalent, and that the communists perpetuated genocide." The fact that a Jewish resistance fighter was indicted by the Lithuanian government for war crimes committed while he was a partisan is an instance of soft-core holocaust denial, according to Professor Lipstadt. Another example of soft-core denial was Mel Gibson's interview at the time of the release of *The Passion of the Christ* -- which the Jews, according to Professor Lipstadt, made into a blockbuster by their protests.

Mel Gibson became a holocaust denier, in Professor Lipstadt's eyes, when he mentioned in an interview with Diane Sawyer that "in the Ukraine millions of people were starved to death." As Norman Finkelstein has pointed out in his book *The Holocaust Industry*:

To question a survivor's testimony, to denounce the role of Jewish collaborators, to suggest that Germans suffered during the bombing of Dresden or that any state except Germany committed crimes in World War II-this is all evidence, according to Lipstadt of Holocaust denial. . . . The most "insidious" forms of Holocaust denial, Lipstadt suggest, are "immoral equivalencies": that is denying the uniqueness of The Holocaust.

As conclusive and irrefutable proof that Mel Gibson is a Holocaust denier, Lipstadt mentioned that he said in the same interview that the Jews "died at Auschwitz," not that they were "murdered," which is what he should have said if he wanted to avoid the charge of anti-Semitism. Holocaust denial is also something that can be contracted genetically, like the *goyische* equivalent of Tay-Sachs disease. Professor Lipstadt makes it clear that Mel

Gibson contracted it from his father, or better, because he refused to denounce his father, who was a holocaust denier. As further proof of Mel Gibson's "soft-core holocaust denial," Professor Lipstadt claimed that Gibson said, "My father never lied to me in his life." (Does this mean that genetic transmission of holocaust denial causes an amelioration from the hard-core variety manifested by Hutton Gibson into the soft-core variety manifested by his son? If so, what are the prospects for the third generation? Holocaust doubt?) We are left to assume that Gibson should have behaved more like little Pavlik Moroslav, the Ukrainian boy who denounced his father to the Soviet secret police. Little Pavlik was murdered by his outraged relatives, but the Soviets erected statues and schools in his honor.

Having come up with the taxonomy of holocaust denial, Lipstadt then segued into a discussion of her main claim to fame, namely, the fact that David Irving named her as a defendant in a libel suit, a fact she characterized at another point as being taken out of line and shot. It seems that every cloud has a silver lining. So when Professor Lipstadt was sued for libel, it allowed her and a team of researchers to delve into the work of people like David Irving. Since she had already written a book mentioning Irving, this wasn't especially reassuring, but oblivious to that fact, Lipstadt launched into an analysis of two footnotes. In one instance Irving claimed that Hitler was furious at one of his lieutenants for attacking a Jewish delicatessen at the time of the 1923 beer hall putsch. What Lipstadt uncovered was that Hitler was really furious because said lieutenant didn't wear his uniform during the attack. According to Lipstadt, this discrepancy proves that David Irving made it all up. In recounting this anecdote, Lipstadt seems oblivious to the fact that she is testifying to Irving's acumen as a historian and his ability to get to little known facts. Whether what he said is accurate in detail is precisely the role of historical research, an activity she prohibits in anyone who disagrees with her point of view.

In a second instance, Irving claimed in one of his books that Hitler was furious that Nazis were attacking Jewish businesses and ordered them to stop. What Lipstadt and her team of investigators uncovered is that Hitler was only upset by the arson, but even if that is the case, it is not clear why this should be a legal matter, or worse, reason to ruin a man's livelihood. Don't people write books to have them discussed? Isn't this why we have universities and professors? Isn't this how we learn about the past? Not according to Professor Lipstadt.

Before long it becomes clear that the academy exists, in Lipstadt's view, not to pursue the truth but to punish malefactors who are guilty of thought crimes. What becomes equally apparent before long is just how blood-thirsty Professor Lipstadt can be when it comes to pursuing her enemies. We are talking about something more than personal animus here. We are talking about racial or ethnic animus of the sort that gets expressed in the later novels of Philip Roth or in the late Richard John Neuhaus's magazine *First Things*, where Meir Soloveichik declared that hate is a Jewish virtue.

Lipstadt expressed this hatred by way of anecdote. During her libel trial, Lipstadt was shocked to hear her lawyer tell a BBC interviewer that David Irving wasn't important. When she pressed him on this after the interview, her lawyer assured her that "David Irving was like the dirt-- Lipstadt paused at this point and added parenthetically "he used another word" -- "you step into on the street. The dirt's not important, what's important is that you remove it from your shoe." Lipstadt then referred to the claim that David Irving was a piece of dog shit as "a wonderful analogy" because it "helped her to understand" how to deal with people like this.

Just to show that Lipstadt doesn't apply epithets like that to the *goyim* alone, she also applied the same description verbatim to Norman Finkelstein. In responding to a call when Lipstadt was on a program on National Public Radio, Lipstadt said of Finkelstein: "Think of the dirt you step in on the street and you know what kind of dirt I'm talking about. It has no importance unless you fail to clean it off your shoe before you go into the house." Lipstadt's outburst prompted one listener to write in, "If Professor Lipstadt disagrees with Professor Finkelstein, I suggest that she debate him on the facts instead of being allowed to launch vulgar personal attacks on NPR with impunity."

In an interview which was posted on the Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs website (#11, August 1, 2003) Lipstadt claimed that "as an American," she was "a staunch believer in free speech," but went on to say that "the situation in Germany is different and that there might be room there for a law against Holocaust denial." What comes across here is a strong belief in double standards, which comes down to both praising the academy and then using it as a podium for referring to other people as dog shit. Once again, the academy is instrumentalized into a weapon against holocaust deniers, which is to say, people whom organized Jewry portrays as enemies of the Jewish race, and a place to settle ancestral scores.

Her goal is clear: to get everyone else to view her opponents as dog shit; her quandary, however, is strategic, namely, how to "defeat them and not build them up." As she put it in her talk, "How do you fight these people without building them up or giving them some merit." The answer to that question is "dynamic silence," a theory developed by the AJC in dealing with Gerald L. K. Smith in the '50s, and recounted in Benjamin Ginzberg's book *Fatal Embrace*. Professor Lipstadt, however, got her answer from the lawyer in the Irving libel action. Lipstadt may or may not have read *Fatal Embrace*, but her talk and the hatred she spewed onto her enemies is some indication that disinterested pursuit of the truth is not Professor Lipstadt's goal in life. It's not enough to disagree, as serious historians can and do, with certain assertions in David Irving's writings. Professor Lipstadt insists on total denunciation of everything David Irving ever wrote, followed by a concerted attempt to deprive him of his ability to earn a livelihood. On her blog, Lipstadt gloats that Irving has been reduced to selling Nazi memorabilia, as if concerted efforts to blacklist him in the publishing industry had nothing to do with that fact.

Anyone who does not go along with this campaign is suspect and guilty of fraternizing with the enemy, which also calls for reprisals. In this Lipstadt differs from Norman Finkelstein, who writes:

Not all revisionist literature-however scurrilous the politics or motivations of its practitioners-is totally useless. . . . [David] Irving, notorious as an admirer of Hitler and sympathizer with German national socialism, has nevertheless, as Gordon Craig points out, made an "indispensable" contribution to our knowledge of World War II. Both Arno Mayer, in his important study of the Nazi holocaust, and Raul Hilberg cite Holocaust denial publications. "If these people want to speak, let them," Hilberg observes, "It only leads those of us who do the research to re-examine what we might have considered as obvious" (*The Holocaust Industry*, p. 71).

Deborah Lipstadt doesn't want to disagree with David Irving. She wants to first humiliate and then destroy him. "We stripped Irving bare," Lipstadt told her audience at Notre Dame. "We made him look silly." Not content to leave it at that, Lipstadt continued that at one point she took out two movies, Charlie Chaplin's *The Great Dictator* and Mel Brooks' *The Producers*. What she learned from watching these movies is that it's not

enough to defeat your enemies (no one brought up the fact that Lipstadt's enemies were people who had written books with which she disagreed), "The point was to dress him in a jester's costume and make him a witness to his own powerlessness."

In other words, academe is for Lipstadt simply the arena in which she humiliates her foes. This view was expressed repeatedly during the course of her talk. Persuasion is not her strong suit, and that, of course, means that it has no place in academic life. "Trying to convince holocaust deniers," she said at another point, "is a hopeless task." It is also a circular argument, to which Professor Lipstadt is as blind as the image of Synagoga on the façade of the cathedral portal in Strassbourg.

Professor Lipstadt credits her researchers with bringing about the victory over David Irving, but in doing so only reinforces the idea that the academy has been weaponized: "The trial was a great tribute to academia; they tracked down that information."

Given all of the resources at her disposal, I began to wonder why Professor Lipstadt hasn't written the definitive Holocaust narrative. In spite of the resources at her disposal, and the fact that she is now on leave of absence from Emory University spending a year immersing herself in "Advanced Holocaust Studies" at the Holocaust Museum in Washington, the only thing she has produced during the last 16 years is an account of the Irving trial. In fact, in the 16 years which have elapsed since she invented the term "holocaust denial," she has produced not one piece of historical scholarship on the period in question. Instead of laying these issues to rest the way scholars do, *i.e.*, with a piece of competent scholarship, Lipstadt has decided to resolve the issue by *force majeure*.

Why is this? Well, maybe it's because Professor Lipstadt's day job as thought cop keeps her so busy she can't do anything else. In her professional activity Professor Lipstadt resembles less the scholar and more the political commissars assigned to units of the Soviet Army or the interrogators at the Cheka, the Soviet secret police, positions that were more often than not staffed by Jews, as Jewish historians have noted. In *The Russian Jew under Tsars and Soviets*, Salo Baron writes:

Perhaps in subconscious retaliation for many years of suffering at the hands of the Russian police, a disproportionate number of Jews joined the new Bolshevik secret service. The impression these facts made upon the ordinary Russian is rightly stressed by Leonard Shapiro:

"For the most prominent and colorful figure after Lenin was Trotsky, in Petrograd the dominant and hated figure was Zinoviev, while anyone who had the misfortune to fall into the hands of the Cheka stood a very good chance of finding himself confronted with, and possibly shot by, a Jewish investigator" (p. 203).

Professor Lipstadt is the spiritual descendant of these Jewish investigators. Professor Lipstadt's job is to shoot anybody in academe or publishing (the current equivalent of the Soviet army) who is not following the party line. Since she can't very well go out and shoot David Irving literally, she does the next best thing by assassinating his character by claiming that he is not really a historian (certainly not a "renowned historian" like Professor Lipstadt) and depriving him of a livelihood.

Professor David O'Connell, who teaches French at Georgia State University, found this out when he published an article on Elie Wiesel in *Culture Wars*. O'Connell's article did what scholarship is supposed to do. It pointed out inconsistencies in the conventional narrative that academe had been cowed into ignoring. It pointed out patent absurdities like the famous picture of Wiesel in Buchenwald; it pointed up the discrepancies in the various accounts Wiesel has given of his liberation from Buchenwald. It brought up the fact that after the release of the PBS documentary *The Liberators*, which purported to describe how an all-black tank battalion liberated Buchenwald, Wiesel suddenly became aware of memories he never had before, memories of being liberated by black soldiers emerging from Sherman tanks. "I will always remember with love," Wiesel wrote in 1989, "a big black soldier. He was crying like a child-tears of all the pain in the world and all the rage. Everyone who was there that day will forever feel a sentiment of gratitude to the American soldiers who liberated us."

It was a truly touching moment. Unfortunately, it never happened. First of all, *Liberators* was made up "to increase Black and Jewish mutual understanding in Brooklyn," and Elie Wiesel wittingly collaborated in that scam. O'Connell's article not only damaged Elie Wiesel's reputation, it also called significant segments of the Holocaust narrative, in particular those recounted by Wiesel, into question. Did Professor O'Connell's *Culture Wars* article then constitute Holocaust denial? This is where the story gets interesting.

After O'Connell's article on Wiesel appeared in the October 2004 issue of *Culture Wars*, Lipstadt wrote to the administration at GSU in an attempt to

get him fired. She claimed in her letter that O'Connell had engaged in "fraud in research." What followed was several pages of single spaced writing in which she questioned O'Connell's spelling of Yiddish and labored mightily to convict Professor O'Connell of fraud. Unwilling to dismiss Lipstadt's letter, the administration at GSU appointed a panel of three full professors to look into the matter. After deliberating for almost a year, from December 2005 to October 2006, the professors concluded that there was no fraud, or that if there were, it was the doing of Elie Wiesel and not Professor O'Connell. If Professor O'Connell didn't get fired, it wasn't for Professor Lipstadt's lack of trying. The fault lay not in Professor Lipstadt's will but in her intellect. In spite of her endowed chair and years immersed in "advanced holocaust studies," she couldn't mount a coherent argument. Every claim she raised was ultimately dismissed as baseless. It was as if she felt she could carry the day by sheer force of will, and was upset to learn that academic life still had a remnant of integrity.

There is probably another reason why the attempt to oust Professor O'Connell failed. The administration at GSU knew if they fired O'Connell on trumped up charges of fraud, that he would then sue them, and the lawsuit would lead to a discovery process that would have been disastrous for both the university and the system of thought control run by the powerful Jews who were orchestrating the campaign, demanding vengeance. In a way, it's a shame this case didn't go to trial. It would have been interesting to learn how Professor Lipstadt heard about Professor O'Connell's article in the first place, and it would have provided a nice counterpoint to the Lipstadt-Irving libel trial in London. It would also have exposed the inner workings of Jewish thought police like Deborah Lipstadt and the role she plays as an enforcer of the Jewish hegemony over academe today.

The O'Connell case makes an interesting counterpoint to the Williamson case as well. Unlike Professor O'Connell, Bishop Williamson did no research, published no article or book, and so had no way to fight back when the counterattack came. This is why he was such a tempting target. This is also why the Jewish organizations have stayed away from David O'Connell. They tried to get him fired and failed because O'Connell had all the facts on his side, and there was nothing that organized Jewry could do about it. As a result, Lipstadt *et al* shifted to the tactic of "dynamic silence," and there the situation at GSU has remained ever since. Professor O'Connell has challenged Professor Lipstadt to a debate, but, as we learned when we

attended her talk, Professor Lipstadt doesn't debate Holocaust deniers. But in this case, that logic isn't compelling, because she herself had to certify that Professor O'Connell was not a Holocaust denier. Unable to prove that O'Connell engaged in fraud, Lipstadt was unable to claim that he was a Holocaust denier. Since she comments on every conceivable delict under the sun on her blog, it seems odd that Professor Lipstadt didn't comment on the challenge to debate the Williamson affair from Professor O'Connell, a man who teaches not far away from where she holds her chair. The logistics of a debate would hardly be insurmountable, or are there other considerations at work here?

I tried to get some idea of the limits of the Holocaust narrative in the question and answer period after her talk. What I got instead was more evidence for the circularity of the term. My question concerned the documentary about the 761st Tank Battalion, an all-Negro unit, which allegedly liberated Buchenwald. Was it Holocaust denial to say that it never happened?

Lipstadt was forced to admit that the Tank Battalion/Buchenwald story was, as she put it in another context, "pure invention," but she refused to see any implications in this for the Holocaust narrative as a whole or for Wiesel's credibility. Wiesel, she claimed, dealing with the latter instance first, was talking about other black soldiers, but since the army wasn't integrated at that point, that would have to mean other Black units, and there were none in the area at the time. As Professor O'Connell pointed out in the article that Lipstadt and presumably her researchers meticulously vetted, "He [Wiesel] made this statement despite the fact that there were no blacks present at the liberation of Buchenwald on April 11, 1945, and the black unit in question was over 50 miles away on that date."

So the question is: is it Holocaust denial to say that the 761st Tank Division didn't liberate Buchenwald?

"No," snapped Lipstadt, "because it never happened." This, of course, brings up bigger issues about the status of the Holocaust narrative itself. Is it riddled, like AIG's portfolio, with "toxic assets." If so, which parts of the Holocaust narrative are not true? Would it have been Holocaust denial to make this claim when everyone, Elie Wiesel included, was effusively praising the PBS documentary? What about other parts of the Holocaust narrative, which have since gone down the memory hole? What about the lampshades made out of Jewish skin? What about the soap made from Jewish fat? What about

the source of the term holocaust itself, *i.e.*, the truckloads of Jewish babies who were thrown into burning pits? As soon as one detail becomes patently absurd, Lipstadt is on the scene to purge it from the collective memory, to ensure that no damage gets done to the holocaust narrative as a whole.

Bigger Issue

This, of course, brings us to the bigger issue, which is, how do we know what really happened? The answer to that question is historical research, but that is precisely what the delict "holocaust denial" has been created to prevent. Holocaust denial is another word for Jewish control of discourse, in particular historical discourse, in particular historical discourse about World War II. If a historian publishes something that a powerful Jew, which is to say a Jew with powerful backers, dislikes, that person will be punished. If the person in question lives by writing books, as David Irving once did, the Lipstadt brigade will get him blacklisted in the publishing industry. If the person in question is a professor, the big Jews will try to get him fired, as Deborah Lipstadt herself did in the case of Professor David O'Connell. In this instance, Lipstadt failed, but David O'Connell's case is not typical in this regard.

More typical is the case of Norman Finkelstein, who was fired from his job at DePaul University in Chicago. The fact that Finkelstein was a Jew himself doesn't matter. It's the big Jews, in this case Alan Dershowitz, who decide who is to live and who is to die in academe and publishing. Finkelstein wrote a devastating critique of Dershowitz's book *The Case for Israel*, and, as a result, Dershowitz set out to destroy Finkelstein's career. It was, in many ways, a typically Jewish response, the academic version of "You'll never work in this town again." What followed was equally Jewish. In fact Finkelstein characterized the dispute as a contest over "who was the toughest Jew from Borough Park." The definitive answer to that question is in: the big Jew from Borough Park is Alan Dershowitz, who got Finkelstein fired with the collaboration of the supine Catholic priest who is president of DePaul University. Among other things, this also shows that a selection process is at work among Jews in academe. Any Jew who goes against the interests of organized Jewry will get destroyed by the ruthless academic enforcer Jews who represent their interests. Most Jews are immune to struggles like this because they fall into the broad, gray middle category of fellow travelers, Jews who go along with the agenda in order to collect big salaries for a cushy job.

But there are larger lessons to be learned here. First of all, when it comes to a choice between money and principle, Catholic universities go for the money. Secondly, the fact that academe has become the site of unseemly

brawls like this is largely the result of Jewish influence in academe. As Professor Lipstadt made abundantly clear in her talk, the university not the place where the big Jews seek the truth. The university is a place where Jews settle scores. It's where they punish people who threaten the Jewish hegemony over discourse.

This should not surprise us. The university is not a Jewish creation. It is a Catholic creation of the Catholic Middle Ages, and so it should not come as a surprise that Jews have all of the difficulties which come with functioning in an alien environment when they are admitted to universities. For over 600 years, from roughly the beginning of the 13th to the middle of the 19th century, Catholics were involved in the creation and preservation of the university as a place where one engaged in the disinterested pursuit of the truth. This was also the place and period of time during which representational art reached its culmination as well. The link between these phenomena--art and the university as manifestations of the Logos which finds its embodiment in Christ and its cultural expression in Catholicism--is no coincidence. Conversely, the Jewish subversion of academe is similar to the Jewish subversion of the art world, something which occurred during the same period of time and, as Israel Shamir points out in a brilliant article "A Study of Art," in his book, *Caballa of Power*, for the same reasons.

Modern art is controlled by Jews. Shamir is sensitive to the sensibilities this claim offends -- "'Does it matter that they are Jewish?' asks the annoyed reader" -- but the facts speak for themselves:

The Jewish influence in modern art is well attested. By 1973, some estimated that 75-80 percent of the 2500 core "art market" personnel of the United States--art dealers, art curators, art critics, and art collectors--were Jewish. In 2001, according to ARTnews, at least eight of the "Top Ten" US art collectors were Jewish: Debbie and Leon Black, Edythe and Eli Broad, Doris and Donald Fisher, Ronnie and Samuel Heyman, Marie-Josée and Henry R. Kravits, Evelyn and Leonard Lauder, Jo Carole and Ronald S. Lauder, and Stephen Wynn.

"Today," wrote Gerald Krefetz in 1982, "Jews enjoy every phase of the art world: as artists, dealers, collectors, critics, curators, consultants, and patrons. In fact the contemporary art scene has a strong Jewish flavour. In some circles, the wheelers and dealers are referred to as the Jewish Mafia since they command power, prestige, and most of all

money."

In 1996 Jewish art historian Eunice Lipton explained that she went into a career as an art historian in order to be in a field dominated by Jews: "I wanted to be where the Jews were, that is, I wanted a profession that would allow me tacitly to acknowledge my Jewishness through the company that I kept." The field of art history was filled with Jews. At the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, Arthur Ochs Sulzberger (former publisher of the New York Times) eventually became its chairman. He oversaw an institution in which Jews, said George Goodman, "have enriched every area of the Museum's collections . . ."

By the 1980s, four of the ten board members that dole out the MacArthur Foundation "genius awards" were also Jewish; two Jews also sat on the board of the Russell Sage Foundation. The Kaplan Fund also has had an important impact on the art community in divvying out awards. One of J. M. Kaplan's daughters was the Chairman of the New York State Arts Council. Joan Kaplan Davidson was appointed as chairman of the \$34 million New York State Arts Council in 1975 despite the fact that she was "not professionally trained in the arts." The Getty Museum . . . has consistently had Jews at the economic helm. . . . [former chairman] Harold Williams . . . was "raised in a Labor Zionist home in East Los Angeles." The new president of the J. Paul Getty trust is another Jewish administrator, Barry Munitz,

After a summary that covers the whole spectrum of modern art, Shamir concludes nonetheless that, "The fact that Jews are so dominating in the art world is very rarely publicly acknowledged. It is forbidden-for anyone, anywhere -- to discuss the subject for fear of being branded 'anti-Semitic.'"

The art world is dominated by Jews, not because they are good at producing art, but rather because during the course of the 20th century, Jewish ascendancy rose in America and American ascendancy rose in the world and the art world as well. As a result: "The artist as creator of art disappeared and gave place to the museum curator, the collection owner. It is he who decides what sort of junk will be displayed, whose name will be written under the photo of tinned soup or a dead rat."

Shamir is basing his verdict in this instance on a visit to the Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao, a Jewish creation (both the architect Frank

Gehry and the funders, the Guggenheim family, were Jews) which is filled with junk and, inexplicably, an exhibition of Armani suits. In this world of Jewish art, "Only the Armani brand reigns supreme, impervious to the curator's will." The Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao provides "a good place to contemplate the present decay, nay, demise of European visual art," which is now made up of "Rotten decomposed pig trunks in formaldehyde," pornography, and anything else that "became a piece of art by the decision of two Mammonites, the curator and the collector."

How did this happen? The crucial middle term in both equations (art and the university) is capitalism. The "economic freedom" of capitalism is traceable to the distinction between the Jewish prohibition on taking usury from a fellow Jew, and the permission which allowed it to be taken from "strangers." This differential first brought about a "complete transformation of commerce and industry," and then once capitalist principles became the cultural norm, other institutions (including art and academe) as well:

The theory of price in the Talmud and the Codes in so far as it affected trade between Jew and Jew, is exactly parallel to the scholastic doctrine of *justum pretium* which was prevalent in Europe throughout the Middle Ages. But as between Jew and non-Jew, there was no just price. Price was formed, as it is today, by the "higgling of the market." . . . The differential treatment of non-Jews in Jewish commercial law resulted in the complete transformation of the idea of commerce and industry in the direction of more freedom. If we have called the Jews the Fathers of Free Trade, and therefore the pioneers of capitalism, let us note here that they were prepared for this role by the free-trading spirit of the commercial and industrial law, which received an enormous impetus towards a policy of *laissez-faire* by its attitude toward strangers. Clearly, intercourse with strangers could not but loosen the bonds of personal duties and replace them by economic freedom. (Werner Sombart, *The Jews and Modern Capitalism*, pp. 246-7).

The spirit of capitalism brought about a similar transformation of both the art world and academe. Shamir calls this spirit "Mammon," something which he considers

the personification of capitalist Class Interest. A capitalist may wish to sell drinking water, but Mammon wants to poison all water in order to force everybody to buy drinking water. A capitalist may build the mall;

but Mammon wants to destroy the world outside the mall, for the outside world interferes with the only meaningful occupation, shopping.

Since "Mammon will try to eliminate every distraction to shopping," the Jewish spirit which created the system of Mammon known as capitalism will "turn every kind of art into Conceptual art" because "For Mammonites, Art is a distraction from the most important occupation, adoration of Mammon. Mammonite reviews of Art concentrate on the price of Art."

Jews are never content to integrate themselves into existing structures, whether those structures are states, universities, art museums or the military. They feel compelled to infiltrate and subvert the institutions which admit them as members. In the art world, the name this Jewish infiltration and subversion goes by is "conceptual art." In an article which appeared in *The New Statesman*, Ivan Massow, then chairman of the Institute of Contemporary Arts, "noticed the damage this causes for the artists who are forced to fit into the Procrustean bed of this anti-art":

It seems sad that so many talented young artists, clawing to be noticed for their craft, are forced to ditch their talent and reinvent themselves as creators of video installations, or a machine that produces foam in the middle of a room, in order to be recognized as contemporary artists. ... We need art lovers to tell artists that they're not obliged to reinvent themselves into creators of piles of crap, or pass their work around like samizdat.

As some indication that Deborah Lipstadt's affliction is shared by other descendants of the Cheka, shortly after those words appeared in print, Massow got sacked. Massow's expulsion from the synagogue that the British art establishment had become was, as Shamir points out,

led by the Jewish cultural tsar Nicholas Serota, and by the Jewish art collector and advertising magnate, a friend of Pinochet, Thatcher, and Conrad Black, Charles Saatchi. His power is unique, and an art critic, Norman Rosenthal of the British Royal Academy, suggested that "the Saatchis are probably the most important collectors of modern art anywhere in the world."

Conceptual art isn't art, but it is Jewish. It signals the culmination of the Jewish take-over of modern art. Conceptual art requires no artistic ability, talent or skill. That's why Jews gravitate toward it and promote it. It's an

example of Jews defining art as what they do rather than defining art in its relationship to Logos. It's as if, Shamir says at another point, we all woke up one day and found that only cripples could compete at the Olympics. Or, to give another example, to find out that the high jump had been replaced by a chess match. Jewish domination of the art world was not "due to the great achievements of Jewish artists." Quite to the contrary, Shamir points out that

The Jews were extremely ill-equipped for their conquest of Olympus. For many generations, Jews never entered churches and hardly ever saw paintings. They were conditioned to reject image as part of their rejection of idols. In the course of a two thousand-year-long selection process, the visual gifts of Jews were not developed, as opposed to the abilities to learn, argue, and convince, honed to perfection in the Talmudic environment.

Shamir goes on to add that "Rejection of Christ," the Logos incarnate who is the "main fountain of creativity," was the ultimate reason why Jews could not be artists, because

There is no visual art or poetry outside of God; at best the godless person can imitate art. For this reason, Jews are, as a rule, poor painters and sculptors. . . . While their mastery of word and ideology is very high (well above the average of 100 at 130), their average visual ability is only 75, extremely low. One can consider it a scientific proof of "no art without Christ." Indeed, until recently there were no important Jewish painters or sculptors. The Jewish temple was supposedly built by Phoenecians and Greeks, and it had very few images. Even the Illumination of Jewish manuscripts was usually done by non-Jewish artists, who made very obvious errors trying to copy Jewish letters.

The same thing applies, *mutatis mutandis* to the university. The people whose defining characteristic is rejection of Logos cannot excel in the disinterested pursuit of the truth. If they are allowed into the university they will subvert the principles of the university and redefine academic achievement things that Jews do well. If the university were the Olympics, chess would replace basketball. If Jews controlled the Olympics as effectively as they controlled the art world, only cripples could compete.

In order to disguise their total lack of artistic talent, "Visually handicapped Jews created a similar anomaly -- that of non-visual 'conceptual' art" because "Preparation of these items places no demand on artistic

abilities. They can be done by anybody. Such art is perfectly within Jewish abilities. Moreover, Jews with their good ability to produce ideas and read iconography will surely succeed in it. Jews bend art to fit their abilities, in order for them to succeed in this difficult (for them) occupation."

The culmination of this trend to conceptualize and thereby redefine art can be found in works of "art," like "Piss Christ," an artifact which kills two birds with one stone, combining Jewish subversion of the art world with Jewish hatred of Christ. "Piss Christ" is a work of art because, as Marcel Duchamp once said, it is "in a museum." "Piss Christ" is a work of art because a museum curator said it was. In this instance, the man responsible was Leonard Lauder, the Jew who runs the Whitney Museum, a man who was, according to Shamir, "a great friend of Ariel Sharon." Are we talking about a conspiracy? Shamir lays the blame at the feet of Group Interest:

For Jews, their Group interest lays in undermining visual art, for they can't compete in it. The even deeper Group Interest of Jews is to undermine Christianity, their main enemy. We see this interest satisfied . . . by their relentless attack on Mel Gibson, who dared to produce a film about Christ. ... As sacrality in Europe is unavoidably Christian, profanation of art is certainly within Jewish Group Interests. It does not mean the Jews, or even some Jews, understand that they act in their own group interest.

This is not a new phenomenon. Shamir sees the Saatchis of the world, the Jews responsible for the creation of conceptual art, as the descendants of "The Jews [who] were prominent in the great tragedy of Byzantine art, the iconoclasm. The contemporary writers leave us no doubt: Jews (a powerful community in those days as nowadays) were extremely active in promoting this concept."

The same is true, *mutatis mutandis*, of the university; however, I see the cause of this convergence in the form, which is to say, formal causality. The student of formal causality who attempts to deal with Jewish influence at the university is confronted with a curious philosophical phenomenon. People regularly refer to Catholics, Methodists, and Baptists (As for example, when they say 'Baylor is a Baptist university'), but the minute one refers to Jews, the term is stricken as impermissible.

The issue is philosophical. It is based on a philosophical error known as nominalism, which maintained that there was no such thing as "trees," only

individual birches, pines, oaks, etc. This extreme form of nominalism was noticed by Hilaire Belloc in the 1920s in his book on *The Jews*, when he wrote, "If anyone referred to a swindler as a Jew, he was an anti-Semite," but exposing the absurdity of the claim did little to stop the tendency.

In order to unravel this error at the bottom of what is in reality a ban on thought, we need to distinguish between essence and existence. If I say that a dog is a four-legged creature with fur, I am referring to essence not existence, and my claim is not refuted when someone says, "Yesterday, I saw a hairless, Mexican dog with three legs."

Similarly, the philosophical validity of the term "Catholic" or "Jew" is not refuted when someone claims "I know a Catholic who is proabortion." Or "Are you saying my Jewish mother-in-law is a revolutionary?" Both the Catholic and Jew get their identity *qua* Catholic or Jew from the form. In the case of Catholics, that form is acceptance of Christ the Logos as defined or determined by the Catholic faith, *i.e.*, by scripture, tradition and the Magisterium. In the case of Jews, that form is defined by rejection of Christ and Logos, as determined by rabbinic interpretation of the Talmud. Catholics are formed by the gospels; Jews are formed by the Talmud. The result is two radically different cultures.

If the culmination of Catholic culture was the creation of the university, the culmination of Jewish culture was capitalism, which, over the course of the latter half of the 20th century in America, gradually devoured the university, by restructuring it according to capitalist, which is to say, Jewish principles, in particular those articulated by Milton Friedman and the Chicago Boys, a gang of thugs which rivals Professor Lipstadt in its brutality. The institution of tenure, which was a relic of the Middle Ages, was subverted and then replaced by a system in which Jewish superstar professors like Stanley Fish could earn six figure salaries (While at UIC, Stanley Fish earned more per annum than the Governor of Illinois), while the majority of the teaching was done by wage slave adjuncts.

During the more than half a millennium when Catholics were using the university to develop theology, metaphysics, physics and eventually the sciences that led to the industrial revolution, scholarship for Jews meant studying the Talmud, which meant among other things, learning how to cheat the *goyim* in business transactions and then justify those practices with a veneer of pious rationalization. This is not my opinion; it is the verdict of Heinrich Graetz, the father of Jewish historiography, who claimed in his

magnum opus that the study of the Talmud led to the moral corruption of the Polish Jews:

To twist a phrase out of its meaning, to use all the tricks of the clever advocate, to play upon words, and to condemn what they did not know . . . such were the characteristics of the Polish Jew. . . . Honesty and right-thinking he lost as completely as simplicity and truthfulness. He made himself master of all the gymnastics of the Schools and applied them to obtain advantage over any one more cunning than himself. He took delight in cheating and overreaching, which gave him a sort of joy of victory. But his own people he could not treat that way: they were as knowing as he. It was the non-Jew who, to his loss, felt the consequences of the Talmudically trained mind of the Polish Jew.

This assertion and what follows are recounted in my book [The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit and its Impact on World History](#). The only thing that saved Graetz himself from the fate of Polish Jews was German culture, the German Enlightenment in particular, and role models like Moses Mendelssohn and Salomon Maimun, who saw their own separation from Talmudic culture as a liberation from Jewish bondage.

And yet in spite of that liberation and the rise of the *maskilim* in the Pale of the Settlement, when the Jews were finally admitted to the university in significant numbers, as happened in Russia in the mid-19th century, they used the university as a staging ground for revolutionary activity. The same thing happened in America. In his memoir *Commies*, Ronald Radosh describes how he and other Jews in the Young Communist League were sent from New York to Wisconsin to take over the university there.

The same thing happened in slightly different fashion at Notre Dame. As one has come to expect, the main culprit in this matter was the Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, CSC. In addition to being the president who stole Notre Dame from the Catholic Church, Father Hesburgh has the distinction of hiring the first Jew at Notre Dame, Samuel Shapiro, who was brought into the history department. I knew Shapiro for the last 20 some years of his life; he would show up at my house and plunk himself down on the living room sofa periodically. I visited him in the hospital when he was dying, and I wrote his obituary after his death. In the Middle Ages Catholics were told to avoid contact with Jews because, they were told, the only time a Jew wants to talk with a Christian is to subvert his faith or corrupt his morals. For over 20 years

Sam Shapiro tried to do just that. He attempted to undermine my faith -- largely by trying to convert me to Darwinism -- and I tried to get him to convert to Catholicism. In the end, neither project was successful. I have written about this elsewhere; the obituary can be read at culturewars.com. For now I'd like to propose the Jewish corollary to the above statement, namely, all too often the only time a *goy* wants to talk to a Jew is when the *goy* wants big money. This was true of the princes in Medieval Europe, and it led to misery among the population at large and pogroms against the Jews, who were granted privileges that were invariably economically ruinous for the population at large in exchange for the low interest loans they provided to princes. Needless to say, this deal often included princes of the church.

Hired to Get Money

It certainly applied to Father Hesburgh, an unofficially crowned prince of the Church, who hired Sam Shapiro to get money. Sam told me the story of the hiring more than once. He had just been fired from his job, had been jailed in Cuba, and was nervously looking forward to giving a speech to the history department in the hopes that they would hire him. When he got to Notre Dame, he realized that no speech was necessary. Father Hesburgh had passed the word to the department that Shapiro was to be hired no matter what. When he arrived at Notre Dame to begin teaching in the fall, Shapiro hardly had time to get his suitcases unpacked before he was sent to the Ford Foundation to ask for money. The message Hesburgh wanted to send was clear: Notre Dame was liberal enough for Ford money because they hired Jews.

Privately, however, Hesburgh knew that there were risks involved here. As an ardent devotee of everything Harvard did and stood for (the crowning moment in Hesburgh's career was his being named to the Harvard Board of Overseers), Hesburgh must have been aware that Harvard had strict quotas that limited the number of Jews who got admitted there. There is some indication that Hesburgh not only knew this, but that he also agreed with why Harvard imposed quotas on Jews because he told Ralph McInerny "if you let the Jews in, they take over."

For once Father Hesburgh was prescient, because this is what has happened in both Notre Dame and academe in general, as the rise of a "renowned historian" like Deborah Lipstadt shows. Over the course of the 40 years after Sam Shapiro was hired, Jews were hired in increasing numbers at Notre Dame. Like Deborah Lipstadt, the Jews at Notre Dame make up for their lack of scholarship by their zeal in thought control. A few instances should make this clear.

I was once invited by the Orestes Brownson group, a conservative Catholic organization on campus, to speak on Jan Zizka and the Hussites. When the date of the talk approached I started getting concerned phone calls from the student who was the organization's president informing me that the organization had mysteriously run out of money and couldn't pay me for my talk. After assuring him that the Orestes Brownson society could pay me out of next year's budget (which they never did), I showed up to give my talk and discovered the real reason for the phone calls, namely, Professor Elliot

Barkey, the Jewish professor who was the faculty moderator for this organization. Why was a Jewish professor the moderator for the conservative Catholic organization on campus? Well, because you can take the Jew out of the Cheka, but you can't take the Cheka out of the Jew. Barkey had put pressure on the student to have me canceled, and when that failed he decided to show up for my talk. His silence during the talk continued during the question and answer period afterward. Then after everyone had left the room, he dragged the student moderator back into the room and behind closed doors claimed that I had my facts wrong and was an anti-Semite. I was reminded of Joseph Pfefferkorn, zealous Jewish convert in Germany who ran afoul of Reuchlin and the humanists, and his lament, "A fat Jew has sat on my books!" Barkey sat silent during my entire talk and the question and answer period afterward. If he knew of any factual errors in my talk he could have pointed them out, and we could have discussed them in the open forum that academe is supposed to be. But instead the inner Jew triumphed and in the end Barkey reverted to type and attacked me behind closed doors by picking on an undergraduate who knew even less about the Hussites than Barkey himself.

If this were an isolated incident, we could ascribe it to defective personalities, but the pattern is too big to ignore. The main problem is that, ultimately, the university, like the fine arts academy, is not a Jewish institution, and Jews can only thrive there if they redefine what goes on there to suit their Talmudic proclivities. The converse of this would be money-lending, where Christians, as in the case of the Calvinists in Holland and Geneva, could only succeed by imitating Jews. As a result of this mismatch, academe became a jungle in which the ruthless Jews drove out professors of principle, including other Jews who refused to go along with the agenda of organized Jewry. Jews have been formed by centuries of Talmudic influence to see academe as a place when they can settle ancestral scores. They don't get mad; they get even. Their attempt to have Professor Kevin MacDonald ousted from his position at California State University at Long Beach is just one more instance of the same tendency to turn academe into an institution where the main point is settling scores, not the disinterested pursuit of the truth.

The best example of this at Notre Dame was the late Rabbi Michael Signer, the man who was "looking down on all of us" during Deborah Lipstadt's talk. I have already written about Rabbi Signer while he was alive,

and so there is no need to go into his all but complete lack of scholarly activity now that he is dead.

He did, however, come to mind when Deborah Lipstadt mentioned the joy Jews take in humiliating those who disagree with them. Signer was subtler than Lipstadt in this regard. He would do things like invite Polish bishops to come to Notre Dame to comment on books like Jan Gross's book *Neighbors*, which defamed the Polish nation by fabricating a holocaust narrative out of the incident at Jedwabne. (Again, see *Culture Wars*, for Iwo Pogonowski's version of what really happened.) Signer hoped that he could get the bishop to denounce Poles as anti-Semites. That is why Signer invited him. I was there in the room when he expressed his disappointment that that hadn't happened. It was shortly after that exchange that someone came up to me and shook his fist in my face and said, "Show more respect" because I had asked the bishop about his views on the Jewish attempt to extort reparations payments from the Poles.

Signer's aggression against the Church came out in the courses he taught on the Gospel of St. John. Students came away from his course convinced that St. John was an anti-Semite, but his main accomplishment always remained his ability to schmoose Catholics under the guise of dialogue. He was a master of reading crowds, something that came out when he organized a symposium on Mel Gibson's *Passion of the Christ*, keying up Jesuits or fellow Jews from the film department, depending on how the mood of the crowd was developing.

As a follow-up to my question about the 761st tank battalion, I asked if questioning Elie Wiesel were a form of holocaust denial. At the back of my mind was the following passage in *The Holocaust Industry*, "And to suggest that Wiesel has profited from the Holocaust Industry, or even to question him, amounts to Holocaust denial" (p. 70). I did not have the book in front of me and remembered the note which followed the passage as referring to Lipstadt's book. I was wrong. The previous note referred to her book. Instead of viewing the exchange as a way of getting to the truth, Lipstadt and her handler congratulated themselves afterward on having scored another victory over another hapless *goy* holocaust denier. I know this because a student approached them in the middle of that conversation and relayed the details to me later.

What followed was more interesting. Obviously affected by the Obama invitation and the brouhaha that it was causing on campus, the student then

asked Professor Lipstadt whether she thought abortion was a holocaust. The question elicited nothing but scorn. Lipstadt dismissed it as absurd, and went on to claim that abortion was a good thing, and went on to cite the UN's promotion of it as proof of its goodness. Suddenly UN resolutions weren't so bad after all.

The student then brought up Professor O'Connell's article on Elie Wiesel, but before she could get her question out, Lipstadt dismissed O'Connell as "third rate," and wanted to know how she had come across the article. "My professor assigned in class," replied the student. At this point Professor Lipstadt could no longer restrain the inner Cheka interrogator and demanded to know the professor's name, which the student was smart enough to withhold. One can imagine Professor Lipstadt poring over university course lists until 4:42 in the morning trying to find the offending professor. As in the case of Professor Barkey, you can take the Jew out of the Cheka, but you can't take the Cheka out of the Jew.

In looking at the pictures of Professor Lipstadt on the web, I couldn't help but notice that they looked nothing like the lady who spoke at Notre Dame in March. The photos of Professor Lipstadt on the web show a woman with dark straight hair; the woman who spoke at Notre Dame had red curly hair. The discrepancy brought to mind an article I had just read, that day, on Miklos Gruner and his odd relationship with Elie Wiesel (Ralph Forbes, "Shocking Charges are made against Most Infamous Holocaust 'Survivor,'" *American Free Press*, March 23, 2009, p. 16). Gruner was a Hungarian Jew who was arrested and deported to Auschwitz in May of 1944. When he got to Auschwitz, Gruner met another Jew by the name of Lazar Wiesel, who had the number A-7713 tattooed on his arm. In 1986, Gruner, who was now living in Australia, was contacted by a Swedish journalist who invited him to come to Sweden to meet "an old friend" by the name of Elie Wiesel. Thinking he was going to meet his old friend Lazar, Gruner was shocked when the man who now goes by the name of Elie Wiesel met him at the airport.

I was stunned to see a man I didn't recognize at all, who didn't even speak Hungarian and who was speaking English with a strong French accent so our meeting was over in about ten minutes. As a good-bye gift, the man gave me a book titled *Night*, of which he claimed to be the author. I told everyone there, that this man was not the person he pretended to be.

When Gruner asked to see the tattoo on Wiesel's arm, Wiesel refused, claiming that "he didn't want to exhibit his body." Once the shock wore off, Gruner resolved that "The world must know that Elie Wiesel is an imposter, and I am going to tell it." Gruner even "officially reported to the FBI that Elie Wiesel is an imposter but had no answer"

Perhaps it was the after-effect of reading this story, perhaps it was the light in the room, but after much pondering, I was forced to conclude that the real Professor Lipstadt has been kidnapped by neo-Nazis and is now being held in a basement in Potsdam near Hitler's bunker. These same neo-Nazis have obviously put an imposter in the place of "the nice Jewish girl" (her description of herself) who grew up in New York and attended City College there.

I say this in all seriousness because I can't imagine why any Jewish organization would fund someone as dull-witted, mean-spirited, vindictive, and hate-filled as Professor Lipstadt to be their emissary. Why would they promote a woman who makes Heinrich Himmler seem warm and sympathetic by comparison? There is only one cogent answer to the question of *cui bono* here, and that is that the imposter Professor Lipstadt must have been put in place by Neo-Nazis or skinheads or some other group interested in promoting the spread of anti-Semitism. No one promotes the spread of anti-Semitism better than Professor Lipstadt. I noticed a significant "uptick" the minute she opened her mouth. Professor Lipstadt combines the *chutzpah* of Alan Dershowitz with the scholarly acumen of Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, all in one package. Professor Lipstadt gives new meaning to the term "toxic asset." Could Goebbels have come up with a better caricature of the obnoxious Jew? No one, not even Israeli soldiers dropping white phosphorus on Palestinian women and children in Gaza, proves more conclusively that the main source of anti-Semitism in the world today is Jewish behavior.

There is, of course, one other possibility, and that is that Professor Lipstadt (or the Neo-Nazi-funded imposter who is now going around using her name) is not a commissar at all. She is, in fact, an *agent provocateur*. The imposter Professor Lipstadt's job is to provoke anti-Semitism. In this Professor Lipstadt is like the arsonist in the fire department. She gets to rush in and put out the fires which she herself created.

I don't want to press this issue farther than prudence allows, but there is also evidence linking Deborah Lipstadt and Notre Dame President John Jenkins in this regard. In fact there is every bit as much evidence that the real

Johnny Jenkins has been kidnapped as well and that an imposter has been installed as president of Notre Dame. The same arguments apply here as well. Once again, I ask, "*cui bono?*" Can anyone in his right mind believe that a Holy Cross priest who had a reputation as a conservative Thomist in the philosophy department would, as one of his first acts, approve performances of an obscene piece of agitprop like *The Vagina Monologues* in the name of academic freedom? No, the very idea is so preposterous it makes all but certain my claim that the real Johnny Jenkins has been kidnapped and some ADL agent put in his place to make the Catholic Church look both supine and ridiculous. Still not convinced? Well, as an example of the one play that would get banned at Notre Dame, Jenkins (or, more likely, the Jewish ADL imposter who took his place) listed the Oberammergau Passion Play! Who but a covert agent of the ADL could come up with something more calculated to make Catholics look like idiots?!

Ultimately, there is no mystery about why Notre Dame should be interested in simultaneously inviting both Deborah Lipstadt and Barack Obama to speak at Notre Dame. The Lipstadt redaction of the Holocaust lets every other promoter of murder off the hook. If the Holocaust is *sui generis*, then Obama's promotion of the abortion holocaust is no big deal. There is no abortion Holocaust in fact. Her presence allows Father Jenkins to be the converse of the people who talk about dead babies in America and Ukrainians who got starved to death by the Jew Lazar Kaganovich and his henchmen. It allows him to become a holocaust denier in good standing, which is to say in good standing with the Jews, the only people whose opinion matters at Notre Dame.

Chapter Three: Bishop Williamson at the End of His Tether

When the Eye of Sauron that goes by the name of mass communication first fastened its fiery gaze on Bishop Richard Williamson in the wake of the pope's attempt to bring the Society of St Pius X back into communion with the Church by lifting the excommunications that followed *latae sententiae* from the act that made Williamson a bishop, his excellency was living in Argentina, where he was rector of one of the society's seminaries. He now lives in Wimbledon, England, home of the famous tennis tournament. If home is the place that has to take you in when no one else wants you, it's clear that the SSPX headquarters on Arthur Road was his home. The lifting of the excommunications as a prelude to healing the schism gave birth to the hope that Bishop Williamson might find a home in the Church again, but, as I approached Wimbledon, the signals were mixed. The lifting of the excommunications signaled the start of negotiations, but the signals emanating from the negotiations were also mixed. Walter Cardinal Kasper announced a few days before my arrival that the negotiations were going nowhere; indications from the other side were equally gloomy. Bishop Fellay, another of the four bishops, had been interviewed at the SSPX seminary in Winona, Minnesota and the interview had been posted on YouTube. Fellay began the interview by throwing Williamson under the bus, and it went downhill from there. "The Church has cancer," Bishop Fellay opined, "and if we embrace the Church we'll get cancer." He went on to say that the SSPX reserved the right to consecrate other bishops if the negotiations turned out to be unsatisfactory. Hope for unity seemed a long way off as I gazed at the preparations for this year's Wimbledon tennis tournament from a passing train. The fields surrounding Wimbledon were full of people, many of whom were pitching tents on this blazingly hot day in late June.

The hubbub surrounding the tennis match seemed particularly distant because at this particular moment a Ugandan by the name of Jasper was shouting the letter to the Hebrews into my ear above the din of the train. Jasper began the conversation by informing me that he used to be a Catholic. He was, in fact, a seminarian, until he was captured by the Ugandan revolutionary movement known as The Lord's Army and marched off to God

knows where. As Ugandan armies go, the Lord's Army was probably not as bad as the army of Idi Amin, which murdered hundreds of thousands of Ugandans and dumped them into the Nile. There were so many corpses in the water that even the crocodiles couldn't eat them all. As a result, they began clogging the intake pipes of the local power plant. So being a captive of the Lord's Army wasn't as bad as the situation a few years before, but it was no picnic either. Jasper and his fellow captives were marching somewhere or other when they ran into the current regime's army, the successors of Idi Amin, at which point a firefight ensued and Jasper was wounded in the leg.

At this point he paused in his autobiographical narrative to reach down and pull up the left leg of his trousers to reveal a number of coin size scars on his chocolate-brown leg.

"That's where the bullets entered my leg," he says.

At this point everyone in the train stops what they are doing and takes a look at his leg. Then they gaze away and go back to their newspapers or gaze off into space listening to their I-pods. Jasper in similar fashion goes back to reading the epistle of Paul to the Hebrews, pausing for emphasis to read "and remember always to welcome strangers, for by doing this some people have entertained angels without knowing it." It's clear that Jasper feels that this passage has some special relevance to our situation.

The scripture passage gets caught on a branch of my consciousness like a valuable article of clothing being washed downstream in the torrent of words which has been spouting from Jasper's mouth ever since I suggested that he rejoin the Church. Everyone, it seems, is a spiritual Robinson Crusoe these days, willfully marooning himself on a spiritual island of his own choosing and declaring himself his own pope. I try hard to concentrate on what he is saying, especially when he refers our present encounter to the angel quote in Hebrews, but at the moment I can't figure out whether I'm supposed to be the angel to him or he the angel to me.

"You need faith," he tells me.

"No," I reply, half wondering what the London commuters are making of our conversation. "I have faith. You need the Church." My reply unleashes another torrent of Bible verses of the sort I have heard more than once from ardent fundamentalists in America. When I bring up, "You are Peter and upon this rock I will build my church and the gates of Hell will not prevail against it," Jasper goes etymological on me, claiming that "ecclesia" means "assembly," which is true enough, and that therefore any assembly which

proclaims the word of God is the Church.

"You and I are church," Jasper tells me earnestly, omitting the definite article like someone in the liturgy program at Notre Dame.

"No, we're not," I reply. "I am a member of the Church and you are an ex-member, and that's the point of this whole discussion."

This too elicits another torrent of scripture, which pours forth from his mouth like the flood-swollen river in Brazil which I saw the night before on the BBC. The theological equivalent of refrigerators, cars, hen houses, etc., sweep past my ears as I try to assess the theological significance of it all. This must be happening for a reason, I keep telling myself, but all I can say to Jasper is, "You're not listening to what I'm saying," which, of course, releases another torrent of scriptural passages, which would still be pouring forth as I write this if the train hadn't arrived at Wimbledon Park station, at which point I get up and disembark.

At some point during our conversation, I told Jasper that I was going to give a talk on the priest sex abuse crisis in Ireland. The image this conjures in Jasper's mind must be fertile because it mutates over the course of our train ride together into a scene in which he envisions me arriving in a house full of pedophile priests with nothing more in my spiritual arsenal than the talk I've prepared to defend myself. It's clear he doesn't think much of giving talks. He urges me instead to cast out demons in the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ. For a moment I consider taking him at his ill-informed word. Pedophilia, schism, whatever: chuck the talk and drive out the demons with a command. The idea would recur to me throughout the day.

When I got to St. George's House on Arthur Road, the headquarters of the SSPX in England, Bishop Williamson greeted me at the door. It's been roughly ten years since we last met in person, at the SSPX seminary in Winona, Minnesota, where I gave a talk to the seminarians on horror movies. This time the conversation was more focused on the situation in the Church. After the initial pleasantries, his excellency informed me that, as a result of the media circus of 2009, he had been stripped of all assignments in the SSPX. This comes as no surprise because I had seen the Bishop Fellay interview on YouTube. So, after being expelled from Argentina, Bishop Williamson returned to England, where he now resides, all dressed up with no place to go. Whatever hopes which the lifting of the excommunications in January 2009 engendered were superseded by the uproar surrounding the media lynch mob which attempted to derail any reunification of the society

and the Church by bringing up the issue of holocaust denial. By now the waves of that storm have subsided, but it looks as if the chances of reconciliation have subsided with them.

As I mentioned, shortly before I arrived in England, Walter Cardinal Kasper announced that Rome's negotiations with the SSPX were not going well. Writing on the Chiesa.com Website, Sandro Magistro wrote that Kasper's misgivings were amplified in an article written by Eberhard Schockenhoff, one of Kasper's former students, and now professor of moral theology at the University of Freiburg. The article appeared in the April 2010 issue of the German Jesuit magazine *Stimmen der Zeit*, and in it Schockenhoff claimed "that the real disagreement between the Church of Rome and the Lefebvrists does not concern the Mass in Latin, but the teaching of Vatican II, especially on ecclesiology and on freedom of conscience and religion." Both Schockenhoff and Kasper fear that the readmission of the SSPX will doom their interpretation of Vatican II and all of the projects of the past forty-some years which have been based on it. Schockenhoff fears that "exegetical manipulation of the conciliar texts" will allow both Rome and the SSPX to marginalize the true meaning of the council by misrepresenting what Schockenhoff and presumably Kasper consider genuine reforms as postconciliar misunderstandings and aborted experiments. This would allow an "antimodern protest movement based on preconciliar Catholicism" to be smuggled into the Church. It would also mark the end (although Schockenhoff doesn't say this) of the hegemony of the German professors, whose interpretation has been dominant but fading since the end of the council. The influence of the German professors has faded even more, paradoxically, since the accession of Benedict XVI (the quintessential German professor) to the chair of Peter. Schockenhoff compares the negotiations with the SSPX to "a hermeneutic tightrope walk, which attempts to square the circle." He also compares it to "playing with fire." The issue is interpretation: Whose interpretation of the council is going to prevail? Put another way, readmitting the SSPX would mean the end of the hegemony of the German professors' interpretation of the Council, which the German professors like to portray as "the will of the majority of the Council fathers":

By proposing an official interpretation, another meaning gets imposed on central conciliar texts other than the meaning which the will of the majority of the Council fathers intended. . . . What's at stake here

is the direction of the future path of the Church, a direction which the Council chose when it decided to open itself up to the modern world, when it chose ecumenical solidarity with the orthodox and reformation churches as well as dialogue with the Jews and other world religions.

The main person responsible for wanting to "square the circle," *i.e.*, make the council documents compatible with both modernity and tradition is, in Schockenhoff's view, Pope Benedict XVI. Magister claims that "In explaining how to interpret the Council correctly, Benedict XVI shows how it did in fact introduce new developments with respect to the past, but always in continuity with 'the deepest patrimony of the Church.'" And as an example of this interplay between newness and continuity, the pope illustrates precisely the conciliar ideas on freedom of religion: the main point of division between the Church and the Lefebvrists."

On December 22, 2005, Pope Benedict gave a speech to the curia in which he tried to explain the *Zeitgeist* which was regnant when the council was in session:

The Council had to find a new definition of the relationship between the Church and the modern age. This relationship started out difficultly with the Galileo trial. It broke completely, when Kant defined "religion within pure reason" and when, in the radical phase of the French Revolution, an image of the state and of man was spread that practically intended to crowd out the Church and faith. The clash of the Church's faith with a radical liberalism and also with natural sciences that claimed to embrace, with its knowledge, the totality of reality to its outmost borders, stubbornly setting itself to make the "hypothesis of God" superfluous, had provoked in the 19th century under Pius IX, on the part of the Church, a harsh and radical condemnation of this spirit of the modern age. Thus, there were apparently no grounds for any positive and fruitful agreement, and drastic were also the refusals on the part of those who felt they were the representatives of the modern age.

However, in the meantime, the modern age also had its development. It was becoming clear that the American Revolution had offered a model of the modern state that was different from that theorized by the radical tendencies that had emerged from the second phase of the French Revolution. Natural sciences began, in a more and more clear way, to reflect their own limits, imposed by their own method which, though

achieving great things, was nevertheless not able to comprehend the totality of reality. Thus, both sides began to progressively open up to each other. In the period between the two world wars and even more after the second world war, Catholic statesmen had shown that a modern lay state can exist, which nevertheless is not neutral with respect to values, but lives tapping into the great ethical fonts of Christianity. Catholic social doctrine, as it developed, had become an important model between radical liberalism and the Marxist theory of the state.

As a result of this opening to the modern world, discontinuities began to emerge. Catholics began condemning things that the Saints of previous eras considered praiseworthy. Similarly, things that the Council considered praiseworthy -- things like Schockenhoff's "dialogue with the Jews" -- would have been condemned as pernicious by Church fathers like St. John Chrysostom. Before long the discontinuities became too big and too important to ignore, or as Pope Benedict put it:

It is clear that in all these sectors, which together are one problem, some discontinuities would emerge. Although this may not have been fully appreciated at first, the discontinuities that did emerge -- notwithstanding distinct concrete historical situations and their needs -- did prevent continuity at the level of principles.

The Church now finds herself in the process of reconciling those discontinuities, and it is this process of re-establishing continuity with tradition which Schockenhoff sees as a betrayal of the meaning of the Council. The SSPX, on the other hand, sees the process of reconciliation as a betrayal of Church doctrine, and it is at precisely this impasse that the negotiations with the SSPX stand at the moment.

The pope feels that the Council succeeded at being both new and connected with the past:

By defining in a new way the relationship between the faith of the Church and some essential elements of modern thinking, the Second Vatican Council revised and even corrected some past decisions. But in an apparent discontinuity it has instead preserved and reinforced its intimate nature and true identity. The Church is One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic both before and after the Council, throughout time. It "presses forward amid the persecutions of the world and the consolations of God," announcing the cross and death of the Lord until

he comes (cf *Lumen gentium*, 8).

Yet those who expected that with this fundamental "Yes" to the modern age, all tensions would melt away, and that this "opening up to the world" would render everything harmonious, underestimated the inner tensions and contradictions of the modern age; they underestimated the internal tensions and the dangerous fragility of human nature, which have threatened man's journey throughout all historical periods and configurations. Given man's new power over himself and over matter, these dangers have not disappeared; instead, they have acquired a new dimension. We can clearly illustrate this by looking at current history.

At this point an uncanny similarity emerges between the SSPX and the liberals who want to keep them out of the Church. Both the SSPX and Professor Schockenhoff are arguing that their interpretation of Vatican II should be taken as normative. Both the SSPX and Professor Schockenhoff (for obviously different reasons) would claim that the pope was "attempting to square the circle," by thinking that modernity and Church tradition were reconcilable. Both the SSPX and Professor Schockenhoff have made a particular interpretation of a particular council as the litmus test for membership in the Church. Neither the SSPX nor Professor Schockenhoff seems capable of entertaining the idea that the Church had embarked upon projects in the wake of the council which were based in some sense or other on council documents but which went way beyond what the council documents authorized. "*Gespräch mit dem Judentum*" or dialogue with the Jews is one example cited by Schockenhoff which has led to an almost total discontinuity with the past, something the American bishops discovered when they had to revise their catechism. Should the Church perdure in this particular implementation of the council? Or should she admit that this and other projects which the council spawned, unlike the documents themselves, are nothing more than failed experiments based on an inadequate understanding of what was really happening during the revolutionary '60s? Is the Church committed to repudiating the Gospel in the name of dialogue? One would hope not, but the question needs to be contextualized before it can be answered. If we identify the Council with "*Gespräch mit dem Judentum*," as Professor Schockenhoff does, then the answer is far from clear. Schockenhoff might go so far as to endorse postconciliar aberrations like the

claim that "the Mosaic covenant is eternally valid," a claim both made and repudiated by the American bishops, but would the pope go that far? Probably not. But the pope's track record on continuity in this regard is far from clear. He seems unaware that dialogue with the Jews, as currently practiced, entails repudiating the Gospel, and that proclaiming the Gospel is antithetical to dialogue with the Jews. As things stand now, the issue is far from resolved, and the only thing that unites both the German professors and the SSPX at this point seems to be their belief that the pope is determined to square the circle.

It was clear that there were people within the Church who didn't want reunification to happen because it threatened their interpretation of Vatican II as the normative view. George Weigel was one of the people who felt threatened. "It is not easy," he wrote in an editorial in *Newsweek* in February 2009, "to see how the unity of the Catholic Church will be advanced if the Lefebvrist faction does not publicly and unambiguously affirm Vatican Council II's teaching on the nature of the Church, on religious freedom, and on the sin of anti-Semitism. Absent such an affirmation, pick-and-choose cafeteria Catholicism will be reborn on the far fringes of the Catholic right, just when it was fading into insignificance on the dwindling Catholic left, its longtime home." Having a Neocon like George Weigel accuse the SSPX of "pick-and-choose cafeteria Catholicism" was a classic instance of the pot calling the kettle black. Weigel had been picking and choosing his peculiar brand of Catholicism according to Neocon principles for years, beginning with his justification of the war in Iraq all the way up to his reading of Pope Benedict XVI's encyclical on church social teaching *Caritas in Veritatem*. When Weigel put on his magic neocon glasses to read the pope's encyclical, some passages appeared in gold, which is to say, they were congruent with the neocon agenda, while some passages appeared in red, which meant that they were not and could safely be ignored by real Catholics, which is to say, those who followed the neocon agenda as articulated by George Weigel. To people like this, the holocaust denial brouhaha was the answer to a maiden's prayer because it provided a way to shut down unwelcome discussion of suppressed topics. But by June 2010, the time of my meeting with Bishop Williamson, it looked as if the holocaust issue had been resolved. In the spring of 2010 Williamson was convicted in a German court and fined 180,000 euros, a sum that was later reduced to 10,000 and is now being appealed. Bishop Williamson had "put that issue behind him," as the

politicians like to say. He was now "ready to move on with his life."

Or was he? At the height of the media cycle, Williamson wrote to the pope and suggested that he be thrown, like Jonah, into the sea to calm the waves. That is a fairly close approximation of what happened, but it wasn't the pope who threw his excellency into the sea, it was Bishop Fellay, who threw him under the bus. Richard Williamson is now a bishop without a portfolio. In addition to removing him from the seminary in Argentina, Bishop Fellay has forbidden Williamson from saying anything in public, including presumably granting interviews to people like me.

If there was an assumption on my part behind this meeting it was that the lifting of the excommunications and the subsequent holocaust denial brouhaha had changed the situation. The only evidence I had to go on was Williamson volunteering to be thrown into the sea, but that seemed indication enough that the situation had changed him. The lifting of the excommunications had certainly changed my attitude toward the SSPX—from accusations of the sort that we had leveled in the investigative pieces we had run in the '90s to a desire to do whatever it took to restore full communion. Actually, that desire had come into existence long before the excommunications had been lifted. When we had met at the SSPX seminary in Winona in the '90s, I had asked his excellency what I could do to help end the schism. His reply was simple enough, "Get Rome to revoke Vatican II."

"Is that all?" I said jokingly back then.

The more we talked, however, the more I had the sinking feeling that nothing had changed. "*Semper idem*" (always the same) was the motto of Cardinal Ottaviani and the phrase had always seemed appealing in dealing with the modernists, but now it began to recur in a different, less positive light, which is to say, not so much as a reaffirmation of tradition, but as the theological version of Groundhog Day, the movie in which Bill Murray plays a weatherman from Pittsburgh who finds himself repeating the same day over and over again. The SSPX had been claiming for over 20 years that the issue was doctrine, specifically doctrinal issues concerning Vatican II, and in the wake of the excommunications, they had persuaded Rome to engage in dialogue under those auspices, but now it was clear, as Cardinal Kasper had pointed out, that the dialogue was going nowhere.

This is not surprising because doctrine was never the heart of the matter. In fact, by allowing the dialogue on doctrine to proceed, Rome had fatally undermined its own position. The real issue is schism, not doctrine.

Heresy is a sin against doctrine, and in the negotiations which followed the lifting of the excommunications, the SSPX was engaged in an attempt to turn the tables on Rome and convince them that they were guilty of heresy. Before entering into dialogue with the SSPX, Rome would have done better to watch Bishop Fellay's interview on YouTube. In it, Fellay gets to the heart of the matter when he says, "The Church has cancer. We don't want to embrace the Church because then we'll get cancer too."

If anyone had any doubts about the SSPX being in schism, this interview should have laid them to rest. As St. Augustine pointed out in both his treatises on Baptism and the Donatists, schism has nothing to do with doctrine. Schism is a sin against charity. It involves breaking communion out of fear of contamination -- which is precisely how Bishop Fellay framed the issue in his YouTube interview. Bishop Williamson has his own YouTube interview, filmed in January 2010, in which he says essentially the same thing. The only difference is that in his interview Williamson claims that the Church has leprosy. In medical terms, the analogy is more apt because leprosy is contagious, but the thought is essentially the same. The SSPX broke communion with the Church when Archbishop Lefebvre consecrated Williamson and Fellay and two other bishops. Refusal of communion out of fear of contamination is, as anyone who has read St. Augustine knows, the classic expression of schism, but evidently no one in Rome noticed this when they began their negotiations with the SSPX because instead of dealing with the issue at hand, Rome embarked upon the theological equivalent of Mission Impossible, which is to say a theological discussion of the documents of Vatican with a group of people who were using doctrine as a pretext to avoid talking about their own lack of charity.

What Rome overlooked in this matter was the psychological need on the part of the SSPX to divert the negotiations into a discussion of doctrine. That need is based more on guilt than anything in the documents of Vatican II. The SSPX committed a sin against charity when Archbishop Lefebvre, claiming that a state of emergency existed in the Church, broke communion by consecrating the four bishops. Their justification for breaking communion is ultimately irrelevant because the Church is always to some extent or other in a state of emergency because the Church is always at the mercy of the venal and wicked men who rise to positions of power in it because such men always rise to positions of power in human institutions, but no state of emergency (real or imagined) ever justifies breaking communion. The Irish

priest sex abuse crisis is a case in point, and it was the invitation to discuss that crisis in the light of tradition which brought me to the SSPX headquarters in Wimbledon in the first place.

The Priest Crisis in Ireland

In a pastoral letter addressed to the Church in Ireland dated March 19, 2010, Pope Benedict XIV claimed that in order to recover from the wound which a number of Irish priests had inflicted on the young people entrusted to their care

the Church in Ireland must first acknowledge before the Lord and before others the serious sins committed against defenseless children. Such an acknowledgement, accompanied by sincere sorrow for the damage caused to these victims and their families, must lead to a concerted effort to ensure the protection of children from similar crimes in the future.

The pope based his letter largely on the findings of The Murphy Report, which had been published on November 26, 2009 and found that "child abuse by clerics was widespread throughout the period under review."

More crucial to a correct understanding of the Irish sexual abuse crisis is an understanding of the "period under review." Most of the cases of abuse which the Church is now confronting took place in a period whose epicenter was roughly 30 to 40 years ago. In order to understand the crisis then, we need to understand what Germans call the *Zeitgeist*, or the spirit of the times, the times being largely the '70s, when roughly ten years after the Second Vatican Council ended the Church was in the throes of its implementation.

The pope adverts to this time period in his letter:

Significant too was the tendency during this period, also on the part of priests and religious, to adopt ways of thinking and assessing secular realities without sufficient reference to the Gospel. The programme of renewal proposed by the Second Vatican Council was sometimes misinterpreted and indeed, in the light of the profound social changes that were taking place, it was far from easy to know how best to implement it.

One of the main characteristics of this period, according to the pope, was

a well-intentioned but misguided tendency to avoid penal approaches to canonically irregular situations. It is in this overall context that we must try to understand the disturbing problem of child sexual

abuse, which has contributed in no small measure to the weakening of the faith and the loss of respect for the Church and her teachings.

The Murphy Report makes clear that the Church did not apply the remedies which Canon Law provides in the case of sexual abuse. Instead, the diocese of Dublin set aside the penal process of canon law in favor of a purely "pastoral" approach which was, in the Commission's view, wholly ineffective as a means of controlling clerical child sexual abuse." During the course of its investigations, the Commission learned that "In the mid 1970s there was no public, professional or Government perception either in Ireland or internationally that child sexual abuse constituted a societal problem or was a major risk to children." As one commentator put it:

The pages of the Murphy Report are littered with instances of carelessness, incompetence and moral cowardice. Over the past fifteen to twenty years they have been flailing about, trying to get to grips with a seemingly intractable problem. Far too often their response has been, at best, inadequate. A line from the Report which rings particularly true refers to a priest who had the impression of Archbishop Connell that he "came across as someone who really cared for the victim but had not "got a clue" about how to go about dealing with the reality of the problem." Many of the other Bishops give a similar impression.

Pope Benedict was unsparing in his criticism of the priests who betrayed the trust of those whom they were called to serve and the bishops who were derelict in exercising proper oversight, but Paragraph 4 of his pastoral letter indicates that other forces were at work as well.

In recent decades the Church in your country has had to confront new and serious challenges to the faith arising from the rapid transformation and secularization of Irish society. Fast-paced social change has occurred, often adversely affecting people's traditional adherence to Catholic teaching and values. All too often, the sacramental and devotional practices that sustain faith and enable it to grow, such as frequent confession, daily prayer and annual retreats were neglected. Only by examining carefully the many elements that gave rise to the present crisis can a clear-sighted diagnosis of its causes be undertaken and effective remedies be found.

Commenting on the pope's letter in a symposium at Chiesa.com,

(<http://chiesa.espresso.repubblica.it/articolo/1342641>), Sandro Magistro claimed that "Benedict XVI has given the Catholics of Ireland an order never before given by a pope of the modern era to an entire national Church. . . . He told them not only to bring the guilty before the canonical and civil courts, but to put themselves collectively in a state of penance and purification . . . in a public form, before the eyes of all, even the most implacable and mocking adversaries," but the point of the article was, once again the Zeitgeist. As the title of the Magister's article in *La Repubblica* indicated, "Genesis of Crime: the Revolution of the 1960s," the cause of this crime was the sexual revolution of the '60s, an event which was a true revolution and which brought about the sexualization of traditional Catholic cultures, which brought with it the sexualization of the clergy as well.

Taking part in the same symposium, Angelo Cardinal Bagnasco saw "strategies of generalized discredit" behind the news reports as well as more than a little hypocrisy. The media who were calling for the pope's resignation were the same media which had spent decades undermining sexual morality:

In reality, we must all question ourselves, without any more alibis, about a culture that in our time reigns pampered and uncontested, and tends progressively to fray the connective tissue of society as a whole, perhaps even mocking those who try to resist and to oppose it: the attitude that is, of those who cultivate absolute autonomy from the criteria of moral judgment and convey as good and alluring behaviors that are designed according to individual desires and even unbridled instincts. But the exaggeration of sexuality disconnected from its anthropological significance, all-encompassing hedonism, and a relativism that does not admit limits or exceptions, do great harm because they are specious and sometimes so pervasive as to escape notice.

Cardinal Ruini called the crisis in Ireland "part of a strategy that has been underway for centuries" and went on to claim that the German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche had "elaborated" this strategy "with his flair for detail."

According to Nietzsche, the decisive attack on Christianity cannot be brought on the level of truth, but on that of Christian ethics, which he saw as the enemy of the joy of living. And so I would like to ask those who decry scandals of pedophilia mostly when they involve the Catholic

Church, perhaps bringing into question priestly celibacy: would it not be more honest and realistic to recognize that certainly these and other deviations related to sexuality accompany the entire history of the human race, but also that in our time these deviations are further stimulated by the much ballyhooed 'sexual liberation.'

When the exaltation of sexuality pervades every part of life and when autonomy from any moral criterion is claimed for the sexual instinct, it becomes difficult to explain that certain abuses are absolutely to be condemned. In reality, human sexuality from the start is not simply instinctual; it is not the same as that of the other animals. It is, like all of man, a sexuality 'mixed' with reason and morality, which can be lived humanly, and truly bring happiness, only if it is lived this way.

Once again the key to understanding the Irish abuse crisis is understanding "the period under review," which is to say the aftermath of the sexual revolution of the '60s. Professor of sociology Massimo Introvigne, president of CESNUR, the Center for the Studies on New Religion, claimed that the attack on the Church began in earnest during "what the English and the Americans call 'the '60s,' and the Italians, concentrating on the emblematic year of 1968 [call] '*il Sessantotto*.'" This era, according to Professor Introvigne, "increasingly appears as a time of profound disturbances of customs, with crucial and lasting effects on religion."

Benedict XVI in his letter shows that he is aware of the fact that there was in the 1960s an authentic revolution -- no less important than the Protestant Reformation or the French Revolution -- that was "fast-paced" and dealt a tremendous blow to "traditional adherence to Catholic teaching and values."

In the Catholic Church there was not at once a sufficient awareness of the scope of this revolution. In this climate, certainly not all priests who were insufficiently formed or infected by the climate following the '60s and not even a significant percentage of them, became pedophiles. But the study of the revolution of the 1960s and of 1968 is crucial to understanding what happened afterward, including pedophilia. And to finding real remedies. If this revolution, unlike those before it, is moral and spiritual and touches the interiority of man, it is only from the restoration of morality of the spiritual life and of comprehensive truth about the human person that the remedies can ultimately come.

What this and similar commentary makes clear is that talking about the '60s and understanding the '60s are two different things. What all of the critiques have in common is an inadequate understanding of what happened in the '60s and, more importantly, what happened in the aftermath of the sexual revolution, a period which coincided in time with the implementation of the Second Vatican Council.

Cardinal Ruini mentions Nietzsche, who is certainly a villain, but if his eminence was interested in talking about a campaign of revolution, of "a strategy that has been underway for centuries," and sexualization of the culture for political purposes, he would have done better to begin with the Marquis de Sade.

Similarly, Professor Invigne claims

that a single factor cannot explain a revolution of this magnitude. The economic boom and feminism play a part, but also more strictly cultural aspects both outside the churches and Christian communities (the encounter between psychoanalysis and Marxism) and inside them (the 'new theologies').

But he doesn't mention Wilhelm Reich, the man who created the term Sexual Revolution and who also combined psychoanalysis and Marxism to create a weapon that was specifically targeted against the Catholic Church, and even more specifically one which promoted the sexual corruption of the clergy as the best way of reducing the Church's political power.

Reich was a Jew from Galicia, the easternmost province of the Austro-Hungarian empire, who was both a Freudian and a Marxist. Nine years after his death, he became the hero of the '68 revolution in Paris. Two years later he was featured on the cover of the *New York Times* magazine.

By the time Reich had been re-discovered by the New Left in 1969, he had been dead for ten years, but that fact was irrelevant, because the Reich the cultural revolutionaries were interested in promoting had stopped writing in 1933 anyway. On January 4, 1971, Christopher Lehmann-Haupt wrote a review of the new Farrar Straus edition of *The Mass Psychology of Fascism*, which announced in effect that the Reich revival had begun in earnest. "Wilhelm Reich," Lehmann-Haupt proclaimed, "the Austrian sexologist and inventor of the so-called orgone energy accumulator, has made a comeback." Reich, according to the review, was the father of youth culture, the sexual revolution, and the feminist movement. Kate Millett's book *Sexual Politics*

was written under his influence. Beyond that, Reich was better at reconciling Freud and Marx than Marcuse, especially by expounding his "credo that sexual man was man liberated from his need for authority, religion, and marriage." Reich, in other words, "makes considerable sense," at least to someone sympathetic to the goal of sexual liberation. Lehmann-Haupt was, in fact, so enamored of Reich's vision of sexual liberation he was even willing to take a second look at his theory of orgone energy. "Perhaps it's time to reconsider all of Wilhelm Reich," he concluded.

Four months later, on April 18, 1971, the *New York Times* returned to Reich, this time devoting a feature length article in their Sunday magazine to his thought. In "Wilhelm Reich: The Psychiatrist as Revolutionary," David Elkind described how student communards in Berlin pelted the police with soft-bound copies of Reich's *The Mass Psychology of Fascism*. (Was it compassion that kept them from using hardbound copies or frugality?) Reich "was being resurrected everywhere in Europe as a hero/saint to students demanding social reform," and now "many American young people" were "now discovering that Reich is very much their kind of Revolutionary too." This was the case because his message was more appealing to the American Left, who felt that they could bring down the state by sexual license without the sublimation urged by Freud or the political revolution urged by Marx.

Reich is relevant to our discussion because he was a proponent of both child sexuality and the sexual subversion of the clergy. In *The Mass Psychology of Fascism*, Reich claimed that it was pointless to debate the existence of God with a seminarian. However, if the seminarian could be induced to engage in sexual activity, the idea of God "evaporated" from his mind. In *The Mass Psychology of Fascism*, Reich praised "the genuine sociologist who will reckon psychoanalysis' comprehension of childhood sexuality as a highly significant revolutionary act" (p. 28). He goes on to say that the Catholic Church is the main enemy of revolutionary liberation:

With the restriction and suppression of sexuality, the nature of human feeling changes; a sex-negating religion comes into being and gradually develops its own sex-political organization, the church with all its predecessors, the aim of which is nothing other than the eradication of man's sexual desires and consequently of what little happiness there is on earth.

According to Reich: "Sexual inhibition prevents the average adolescent

from thinking and feeling in a rational way." Religion, according to Reich, is nothing more than inhibited sexuality:

Clinical experience shows incontestably that religious sentiments result from inhibited sexuality, that the source of mystical excitation is to be sought in inhibited sexual excitation. The inescapable conclusion of all this is that a clear sexual consciousness and a natural regulation of sexual life must foredoom every form of mysticism; that, in other words, natural sexuality is the archenemy of mystical religion. By carrying on an anti-sexual fight wherever it can, making it the core of its dogmas and putting it in the foreground of its mass propaganda, the church only attests to the correctness of this interpretation.

At another point Reich claims that: "If one succeeds in getting rid of the childhood fear of masturbation and as a result thereof genitality demands gratification, then intellectual insight and sexual gratification are wont to prevail."

The first step to revolution is the promotion of child sexuality because "Sexual consciousness and mystical sentiments cannot coexist." Any revolutionary who regards sexuality as a "private matter" is guilty of a "grave error" because

political reaction . . . always rides on two tracks at the same time: on that of economic policies and that of "moral renewal." Until now, the freedom movement has traveled on one track only. What is needed, therefore, is to master the sexual question on a social scale, to transform the shadowy side of personal life into social mental hygiene, to make the sexual question a part of the total campaign, instead of confining oneself to the question of population politics.

Sexual revolution is, to use Reich's term, "social dynamite," but it cannot work its destructive havoc if the revolutionaries are afraid of getting involved in child sexuality, or as Reich puts it: "if this work is to be carried out by revolutionaries who vie with the church in the asseveration and advocacy of moralistic mysticism, who view the answering of the sexual question as being beneath the 'dignity of revolutionary ideology,' who dismiss childhood masturbation as a 'bourgeois invention,'" it won't work.

In other words the true revolutionary must be willing to promote the sexualization of children. The revolutionary, according to Reich, must "awaken . . . a desire in modern youth, a desire for a new philosophy and for

scientific knowledge about the fight for sexual health, sexual consciousness, and freedom. . . . It is the youth that matters! And they -- this much is certain -- are no longer accessible to a sex-negating ideology on a mass scale. This is our strong point."

Reich's emphasis on the promotion of sexual activity is too pervasive to be ignored:

In the main, revolutionary work with children can only be sex-economic work. Overcome your astonishment and listen patiently. Why is it that children in the pre-pubertal stage can be directed by sexual education in the best and easiest way?

This powerful weapon was never put to use in Germany. And it was those in charge of child organizations who offered the strongest resistance to the proposal that the usual individual treatment of sex education be turned into sex education on a mass scale.

If we could once succeed in engaging the sexual interests of children and adolescents on a mass scale, then reactionary contamination would be faced with a tremendous counterforce -- and political reaction would be powerless.

. . . the mechanism that makes masses of people incapable of freedom is the social suppression of genital sexuality in small children, adolescents, and adults.

In order to bring about revolution, the true revolutionary, according to Reich, must promote sex with children. He must also promote the sexualization of the Catholic clergy because the Catholic Church is the main obstacle to the revolutionary take-over of Austrian society:

The case of clerics is especially difficult, for a convincing continuation of their profession, whose physical consequences they have felt on their own body, has become impossible. The only course open to many of them is to replace their priesthood with religious research or teaching.

Taken together Reich's promotion of child sexuality and the sexualization of the Catholic clergy became the blueprint for the subversion of the Catholic Church. This campaign began in the wake of the Second Vatican Council but it reached its culmination in the priest abuse crisis of the

first decade of the 21st century. Reich's theories were put into practice during the sexual revolution of the '60s, but it would take decades before their full effect would be felt.

The Left put Reich's theories into practice during the '60s. In an article which appeared in the Austrian magazine *Die Aula* in February 2001, a translation of which was reprinted in English in *Culture Wars* in May of that year, Hans Fingeller explained how the sexual revolutionaries "used children as experimental guinea pigs in the sensitive area of sexual development":

Wilhelm Reich, a wacko follower of Sigmund Freud, proposed certain theses on how one might "liberate" the sexuality of children, which the "Spontis" and APO [*Ausserparlamentarische Opposition*] revolutionaries used as an excuse to carry out certain experiments with children. . . . As a result of absorbing Reich's theories, the '68 generation began experimenting on their own children, who were now being raised not in public or religious schools, but rather in "alternative day care centers" in which zealous comrades attempted to create out of this 'human material' the "New Man" not by any biological process but by the deliberate application of Marxist ideology to the classroom.

In his book *Linke Lebenslügen: eine Ueberfaellige Rechnung* [*Left-wing Lies about Life: a long-overdue Reckoning*] Klaus Rainer Roehl, who was then husband of RAF terrorist Ulrike Meinhof, goes into some detail about the child-rearing practices in Kommune 2, which specialized in raising children according to the Gospel of Wilhelm Reich.

The first goal of this "education" was to replace the attachment of the child to his parents with a relationship to a "relationship person" and as a result inhibit the formation of "the authoritarian family fixation." These activities included pedophilic contact between adults and five year old girls, the details of which I will spare you. You can read the full account in the May 2001 issue of *Culture Wars*.

Daniel Cohn-Bendit is now a member of the European Parliament and the head of the Green Party in France, but during the '60s he was a teacher in one of these day-care centers. After his Comrade-in-Arms Joschka Fischer was named foreign minister of Germany, Cohn-Bendit granted an interview with ZDF, the second German TV channel in which he was asked whether he was ever employed in one of the red day care centers.

"Yes, of course, of course," he replied.

The ZDF reporter then asked him if he published the following text about his experiences there: "it often happened to me that the children would unzip my fly and begin to fondle me."

At that point the eloquent European Parliamentarian had the look of a deer caught in the headlights of an oncoming car.

After lots of hemming and hawing, Cohn-Bendit said that he wouldn't recommend now what he recommended then because "we know a lot more about child abuse."

Then, contradicting what he had written, Cohn-Bendit swore: "I never had anything to do with children."

The ZDF reporter remained unconvinced: "It sounds so autobiographical. The descriptions are so personal, as if you had had sex with children."

Cohn-Bendit replied, "Yeah, but that is not true. That is not true. The same thing goes for the parents . . . I'm not mad if people accuse me of that because it was no secret. I was only thinking that you have to look at it in the context of this time and this period. We're talking about '68. That was then. . . ."

Unlike the Catholic Church, which has apologized for the priests who have engaged in sexual activity with children, the Left in general and the Green Party as its current heir has never "sought ways to repair the damage that they have done to the children of that generation, who were treated like guinea pigs by being subjected to the abstruse ideas of the madman Wilhelm Reich."

Klaus Rainer Poehl writes: "It's in this particular area [the sexualization of children] that his movement has the most to answer for. These evil or stupid deeds have created the biggest aftershock for the movement. It was here that it did its most damage."

Writing around the same time as Hans Fingeller, Herbert Rauter claims that Cohn-Bendit's experiences were "No Isolated Incident." In fact in 1985 the Green Party, the political home of both Cohn-Bendit and Joschka Fischer, advocated the elimination of laws criminalizing sexual relations with children, claiming "they prevent the free development of the personality."

At the beginning of 1985, the Greens proposed legislation which would decriminalize the seduction of girls under 16 years of age as well as homosexual contact with children and teenagers. Their reason? "The threat of punishment inhibits children from discovering their true sexual orientation."

At their state convention in Luedenscheid in March of 1985, the Greens of Nordrhein-Westfalen demanded that "nonviolent sexual activity" between children and adults never be considered as a reason for criminal prosecution. This sort of activity, to the contrary, "must be liberated from all restrictions which this society has placed on it." The fact that this resolution was approved by a majority of those in attendance attests to the fact that they considered sexual relations between children and adults as a form of "social oppression, which places those who are interested in engaging in nonviolent sex with children in the danger of having their entire lives destroyed from one day to the next if it were to become known that they had relations which all of us consider pleasant, productive, development-enhancing, in short, positive for both parties involved. . . . Therefore, we demand that all criminal sanctions against such sexual activity be removed."

In 1985 the Greens in Baden-Wuerttemberg . . . attempted to weaken the criminal sanctions against this form of sexual activity. Consensual sex between adults and children should not be punished. Also in 1985, in their political platform (*Auszuege aus dem Wahlprogram der Alternative Liste Berlin*), the Greens claimed that "It is inhuman to approve sexual activity only for a certain age group and under certain conditions. If young people express the wish to have sex with people of the same age or with older people outside of the family, either because their homosexuality is not accepted by their parents or because they have pedophilic tendencies or for whatever reason, they must be afforded the possibility of acting on these desires."

Let's sum up here. Christopher Hitchens, who has written a book extolling the virtues of atheism and another attacking Mother Teresa, is planning to arrest the pope when he arrives in England in September, but no one is planning to arrest Daniel Cohn-Bendit any time soon. The Church has never condoned this sort of activity in any way, shape or form, much less in the way that the Green Party has, but no one is suing the Green Party for the sexual molestation that took place in the day-care centers of the '60s.

It turns out that *Gaudium et Spes* was off the mark when it claimed that the Church had nothing to fear from the modern world. Modernity has always been the enemy of the Church and it remains so today.

But worse than the machinations of her enemies, the Church has adopted the categories of its oppressors in the name of dialogue and as a result blinded itself to what was really going on during this crucial period of Church history. As a result, the Church is still trying to figure out what

happened during the '60s. Professor Invigne claims that

There was ... a *Sessantotto* in society and also a *Sessantotto* in the Church: 1968 is itself the year of public dissent against the encyclical "*Humanae Vitae*" of Paul VI, a dispute that according to a valuable and influential study by the recently deceased American philosopher Ralph McInerny, *What Went Wrong with Vatican II*, represents a point of no return in the crisis of the principle of authority in the Church.

That book was in many ways the result of 15 years of lunches which Ralph and I had together at the Great Wall Chinese restaurant in South Bend, Indiana. Ralph and I also attended the synod on the Laity in Rome together in the late '80s. Ralph, who died in January, was intimately involved in the Revolution of '68. His novel *The Priest* views it from a ringside seat. For 15 years Ralph and I discussed the state of the Church over Chinese food at the Great Wall. What Professor Invigne didn't know is that we also discussed Notre Dame University's involvement in the sexual revolution. Professor Invigne couldn't have known that because Ralph suppressed all of the information on Notre Dame in his book. The result was an account of this crucial period of Church history which was so truncated that it was seriously misleading. The Chiesa.com symposium is one more proof that the Church is ignorant of its own history. The Church can't win because she is not playing with a full deck.

Missing from Ralph's book was any mention of the role Notre Dame played in the sexualization of the culture, the sexualization of the Catholic Church, or the sexualization of the clergy. This story didn't begin in March 2010. The sexual revolution of 1968 was part of a war against that Church that had been going on in America for over 30 years.

Less than a week after my return to America, it seemed clear that the sex abuse crisis was far from over. In fact, it had by then spread to Belgium, where local police broke into church buildings, barred bishops meeting there from leaving the premises, seized computers and church files, and even bored holes into the tombs of two deceased bishops. The Vatican was outraged by the actions of the Belgian police, claiming that "there are no precedents, not even under the old communist regimes" for such actions, but the Vatican's apologies for sexual abuse combined with their lack of understanding about how the political instrumentalization of sexual deviance worked made political retaliation like this inevitable. The era of dialogue with the modern

world which began with the council ended with the sound of boots on the stairs and the police banging at the door of the Church and a campaign which made *Kulturkampf* and communist oppression seem mild by comparison. The police raids in Belgium certainly provided the possibility of a new interpretation of *Gaudium et Spes*, but no one in Rome was rising to the challenge of the new hermeneutic.

The Church and Her Enemies

In talking with Bishop Williamson, it becomes clear that the doctrinal issue is uppermost in his mind, but that's only because he refuses to admit the real cause of the problem, namely, that the SSPX broke communion. Schism is a word that never gets mentioned in traditional circles. It is only with difficulty that I can broach the topic in our conversation. Bishop Williamson wants to talk about the pope instead, who, according to his view, sometimes says 2 plus 2 equals four and sometimes says 2 plus 2 equals five.

The pope's views of the Council are certainly tied to a view particular *Zeitgeist*, the *Zeitgeist* of the '60s. When he claims that "It was becoming clear that the American Revolution had offered a model of the modern state that was different from that theorized by the radical tendencies that had emerged from the second phase of the French Revolution. . . . Thus, both sides began to progressively open up to each other" what he is really telling us is that he had fallen under the influence of John Courtney Murray and therefore under the influence of *Time Magazine*, which was responsible for Murray's celebrity status, as well as C.D. Jackson, who was the CIA controller/liaison with Time/Life. We are talking about the widespread promotion of the self-induced illusion that the Church no long had enemies.

During the 1930s, the Church had enemies. When the Church was strong, which is to say when it was united, the Church won the battles against her enemies. In 1933, the Church in America took on the Jews in Hollywood when Cardinal Dougherty of Philadelphia called for a boycott of all Warner Brothers theaters in his diocese. The success of that boycott led to the institution of the Hollywood production code. In 1935 the Catholic Church led by Msgr. John A. Ryan, head of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, defeated the WASP ruling class's attempt to get the federal government involved in the funding of contraception. If you ask yourself what had changed in the 30 years between 1933 and 1963, it wasn't Church teaching. Because of Vatican II, the Church believed that she no longer had enemies. In fact, because of a magical process known as dialogue, our former enemies had been transformed into our friends.

Needless to say, this was not the traditional teaching of the Catholic Church. The traditional teaching of the Church had been articulated some 1500 years earlier, when St. Augustine wrote that "Heretics, Jews and Pagans have made a unity against Unity." The loss of its enemies turned the Church

against itself. In the absence of external enemies, the presence of evil in the Church had to be attributed to the Church itself. The Church, to cite Bishop Fellay, developed "cancer."

Benjamin Franklin once wrote that "Experience keeps an expensive school, but fools will learn in no other." What the Church had to learn in the expensive school which experience has conducted for the past 45 years is that nothing has changed. Our enemies were still our enemies. The only thing that had changed was the sophistication of their tactics.

What the pope's 2005 speech to the Curia shows is that Joseph Ratzinger was influenced by a sophisticated disinformation campaign orchestrated by Henry Luce, the publisher of Time/Life, and his Catholic agent, John Courtney Murray. What it does not show is that there are flaws in the conciliar documents. The same is true of *Nostra Aetate* and the Jews, who were paying Malachi Martin to act as a double agent at the council. Now as in the past, the Church continues digesting the documents, which is to say it continues to interpret them in light of tradition, which is what the Church has always done. Archbishop Lefebvre accepted the idea; but, as I was to learn in the course of our conversation, evidently Bishop Williamson cannot.

What we're talking about is the background of council documents like *Dignitatis Humanae* and *Nostra Aetate*, but not the documents themselves, which were vetted by the world's bishops. Having attended more than one synod in Rome, I can see how an individual bishop (or a bishops' conference) might introduce a political agenda into the Church's deliberations, but it is not easy to see how this agenda could prevail. In my experience the only thing that the world's bishops could possibly agree upon is Catholicism. Bishop Williamson claims that there are ambiguous statements in the documents of Vatican II, and that this fact justifies his separation. The former statement is undeniably true; the latter undeniably false.

Maynooth, Ireland, June 19, 2010

Four days before our meeting, I attended a conference on "Fertility, Infertility, Gender," sponsored by the Linacre Centre for Healthcare Ethics at Maynooth, the home of the seminary for Ireland's Catholic priests. The participants at the conference are congenial enough, but looming behind the conference is a pall of both sexual and economic crisis in Ireland and the Irish Church. A bishop freshly deposed by the pope for his negligent handling of the crisis is in attendance. The seminary itself was criticized in recent articles in the Irish press for its tolerance of homosexuality. The sex abuse crisis was the topic of talks I would give in both Dublin and London.

In May 1992 just as the neoconservative counter-counter revolution in America had declared war on Pat Buchanan, the scandal of Bishop Casey of Galway broke over Ireland. According to Mary Kenny's account in *Goodbye to Catholic Ireland*:

Bishop Eamonn Casey had had a love-affair in 1974 with an American divorcee, Annie Murphy, had fathered a child by her, deserted her and suggested the child should be placed for adoption; and then in a desperate attempt to hide the truth had used diocesan funds to pay off the mother's claims.

Is fathering a child out of wedlock wrong? Yes, it is. But once again the press seemed determined to punish the only institution which was willing to uphold moral standards. If illegitimacy were wrong, why weren't the newspapers urging children born out of wedlock to sue the National Basketball Association? Has any institution produced a higher number, per capita, of illegitimate children?

Kenny initially dismissed the story, but before long it became clear that the forces that wanted to destroy Catholic Ireland were not going to let the issue drop.

During these events of the mid-1990s, I would hear people in Ireland say, "it can't get any worse." And then it did. On any Monday in November 1994, the three leading stories on RTE, the national television network, were the political repercussions following the Brendan Smyth case, the collapse and death of the Dublin priest in a homosexual club sauna, and the conviction of the Galway priest for a

sexual assault on a young man: all in one news bulletin. I made no more jokes about Renaissance Popes.

Kenny found that

The wave upon wave of charges and convictions—nearly all were convicted as charged -- was relentless, squalid and depressing. . . . The Brendan Smyth case was not only squalid and depressing: it brought down the government of Albert Reynolds. It was also particularly shocking not just because the offender was an apparently incorrigible paedophile, but because there was evidence that the religious authorities had covered up for him over a number of years. In 1968 he had been given psychiatric counseling for his compulsion, but without apparent amelioration. . . . In its efforts not to "give scandal," it appeared that the Church authorities had enabled a paedophile to continue in his weakness. . . . Some observers predicted that the Peace Process would now falter without the stewardship of Albert Reynolds -- all because of the paedophile priest. . . . it was claimed in Dublin that the breakdown would never have occurred if Albert Reynolds had still been Taoiseach.

The sex crisis, in other words, was used to uproot the last elements of Catholic culture in Ireland. The late Tom Herron recounted how the notoriously anti-Catholic *Irish Times* broke the story, and that in turn

led to the collapse of the government of Albert Reynolds in the Republic of Ireland and the weakening of the Church's influence on Irish society. In this same period the feminist law professor, Mary Robinson, was elected the first female president of the republic and helped to erase traditional sex roles in that country. Her services to the secularization of her native land were appreciated by the international elites when they made her United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees when her term as president was over. Unfortunately Mrs. Robinson's career on the international stage appears to be over as she criticized Israel's treatment of the Palestinian refugees; learning late that no matter how progressive you are there are statements that will end your usefulness to the elites rather quickly.

The Brendan Smyth episode was, in Mary Kenny's words, "yet another onslaught in the ongoing decline and fall of the Irish Catholic Church." But before long, it was becoming clear that the same playbook was being used on

both sides of the Atlantic. In both Ireland and America, the arsonists were on the fire department payroll. This is true not only of the Fourth Estate, which promoted the sexualization of Ireland during the years following the council, and therefore, Ireland's clergy in the first place, but also of the psychological/counseling establishment. After creating the crisis by undermining the morals of the clergy, the psychology/counseling establishment got to cash in on the settlements by offering therapy to the victims. It is an irony not lost on Mary Kenny:

A million pounds was immediately spent on a help-line and counseling after abuse victims of the industrial schools mentioned in *Suffer the Little Children* were opened. It was ironic that the Catholic Church was using the very psychotherapeutic techniques which, 50 years previously, it had so condemned in the works of Freud.

In 1995 Ireland was rocked with revelations about the life of Father Michael Cleary, who had died of cancer in 1993. According to Kenny, Cleary "had been one of Dublin's best-known and most popular priests. Back in the 1960s, he had been hailed as the best type of modernizing young priest, hip and cool, accessible to the young, quick to play a guitar and sing a pop song; and yet at the same time, with strong moral convictions and a strong social conscience."

Unlike the homosexual clergy, who could be counted on to be one-issue, useful idiots, Cleary made the mistake of being both a heterosexual and against abortion. When the woman by whom he had fathered two children published a lurid memoir after his death -- "My Secret Life as Priest's Wife for 27 Years" was a splash front-page headline for the Dublin tabloid, the *Sunday World* -- the Church was again left holding the bag. Once again, celibacy was to blame, and the moral order which the Church defended was henceforth to be considered suspect by the very fact that the Church defended it. "To hell with prayers," wrote Mary Ellen Synon in the *Sunday Independent*.

The feminists then volunteered to be the willing executioners for the therapeutic state. Nell McCafferty, a Derry radical and nationally-known feminist, was both more vehement and more explicit than her colleague at the *Sunday Independent*. McCafferty wrote that Catholic priests had lost all entitlement to discourse upon sexual morality.

Next time they open their mouths on love, sex, contraception,

abortion, homosexuality, pleasure -- on anything that goes on between consenting healthy adults -- their words should be publicly quoted back to them. . . . Now let them shut up while people put themselves and their families back together again, and knock some delicious, loving sexual pleasure out of life. In the meantime, beware the local priest. He is a danger to your mental, physical and sexual health. Never leave one alone with a child. Not ever.

In Ireland as in America, the feminists functioned as the shock troops of the new world order by claiming that the Church had no authority to speak on sexual matters. That was soon extended to include all instances of morality, which of course included any condemnations of avarice, theft, and looting, behaviors which characterize capitalism, which was waiting in the wings to fill the moral vacuum which the feminists had just created by undermining the authority of the Catholic Church.

The Common denominator which both the Neoconservative take-over of Catholic institutions in America and the Irish priest pedophile crisis share is Capitalism. As Mary Kenny put it:

Market capitalism, which is essential to the Celtic tiger boom, depends on individual lifestyle choices, initiative, tolerance of diversity. It also depends on people valuing, not rebuffing, material gain. The "authoritarianism" of the Catholic Church, with its strong directional tradition and concept of orthodoxy, is anathema to the market. Individualism is essential. Those who have studied their Max Weber (*The Protestant Work Ethic and the Rise of Capitalism*) would say that it was not coincidental that Catholicism receded as capitalism triumphed: they would say it was necessary for Catholicism to recede in order for capitalism to triumph. The Protestant mindset, that you make your own choices for salvation, bypassing any form of "priest-craft," is a cultural pre-condition for free market capitalism. Were there any conspiracy-theory Trotskyites left under the age of 60, they might almost suspect a capitalist plot to discredit the priests, to free Ireland for market capitalism.

Ten years later, as abuse reports continued to roll in *Pravda* agreed with Kenny. The by now world-wide sex abuse crisis in the Church

has ideological connotations and follows a political agenda that seeks to deconstruct traditional society and all its secular institutions and

to impose a New World Order after the manner of the sinister interests of the international oligarchy, the same ones that handle the financial markets and through them, largely control the global economy. We refer to cases of pedophilia within the ranks of the Catholic Church recently publicized by international news agencies.

Indeed recent reports of pedophilia involving priests have the outlines of information that journalistic ethics require, regardless of their moral gravity. Such stories raise suspicion about their "goodness" even among non-Catholics like us. Although disagreeing with the doctrine of the Catholic Church, in some respects, but we recognize the importance of their role in our history to defend the ethical values that shape our Judeo-Christian culture and their social merit on behalf of those who have been victims of the usury and greed of the international oligarchy, which is after all more interested in destroying Catholicism and religion in general, as they constitute a serious obstacle to achieving its goal, which is to reduce mankind to the status of robotic slaves.

Pravda mentioned the case of Father Lawrence Murphy as a particularly egregious case of media-inspired witch-hunt:

The fury of the anti-clerical secular lobby goes so far as to revive old cases like that of Father Lawrence Murphy, back in 1975, to address the current Pope insidiously and in this way, the very Roman Catholic Church. On 25 March of this year, the prestigious New York Times published an article that allegedly accused Benedict XVI of covering up for the priest from Milwaukee in 1995 when the Pope was still Cardinal and responsible for the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith It must be motivated by a very strong hatred of Catholicism to raise this issue 35 years afterwards ...

Pravda accuses the *New York Times* of engaging in "a defamatory smear campaign . . . against the world Catholic hierarchy" which is being conducted for the benefit of "philanthropic foundations like the Rockefeller family" whose "financial interests of those are linked to a wide range of economic sectors ranging from banking, oil, pharmaceuticals, military industry, etc., to audio visual media, including the "media", which clearly meets an agenda dictated by the Global Elite to which they belong.

Kenny claims that the rise of Capitalism meant the decline of the

Church. In fact she claimed that capitalism could only flourish in Ireland if the Church were discredited. The publicity campaigns for Capitalist Ireland and against Catholic Ireland were in reality two different sides of the same coin. By 2000, mammon had replaced the Catholic Church as the organizing principle for Irish society:

By 2000, a special Sunday Times survey of Irish 30-year-olds was claiming that for the young Irish "Money is the new religion and they're queuing up to pay homage to the folding stuff. God plays second fiddle to Bill Gates . . . while sin is forgetting to nail down decent equity options. This generation is more likely to worship at a stock exchange than at a cathedral, to seek a pension advisor than a confessor."

The debut in 2000 of the film version of Frank McCort's book *Angela's Ashes* was part of this campaign to discredit the Catholic Church in Ireland and pave the way for unrestrained Capitalism. Kenny feels that "Alan Parker might as well have made a film called How All Irish People are Absolutely Horrible. For there is scarcely anyone in the whole story of provincial Ireland in the 1930s and '40s with an ounce of humanity." Everyone in the Limerick of *Angela's Ashes* is especially beastly to children: "It goes without saying that the Catholic Church is sneering, cruel, rejecting and exploitative, and the charity, the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, is represented by most particularly odious characters who taunt poor women before they patronize them."

The Catholic Church is even blamed for being involved in money-lending.

There is a repellant moneylender who exploits the poor of Limerick, and although for historical reasons which are entirely understandable, moneylenders in Ireland were traditionally Jewish, it is understood now in Ireland by the media that you are only allowed to be nasty about Catholics; so the moneylender in the story has to be made into a spiteful Catholic vixen, complete with statues of the Blessed Virgin scattered about her extortionate book-keeping.

The Jews were left out of the McCourt/Parker story of money-lending in Ireland because the goal of *Angela's Ashes* was to discredit "Catholic Ireland." According to Kenny, the sex abuse crisis was proof that "the *Angela's Ashes* movie was correct after all: Catholic Ireland had been a horrible society, in which horrible people had prevailed. It had been a society in which harshness made for inhumanity."

Mary Kenny wrote her book in 2000 at the height of the economic boom in Ireland known as the Celtic Tiger. By the time I arrived in Ireland ten years later, the Celtic Tiger was dead of its own wretched excess. At the time of my arrival the Irish debt stood at 1,275 percent of Gross Domestic Product, roughly ten times as high as Greece's debt, and yet no one was talking about Ireland.

The people who attended my talk in Dublin were hardly a representative sample of the Irish people, but it was hard not to generalize from their plight. Most of the men were unemployed and living off a combination of welfare and subsistence farming. Ireland has a population of 4 million souls. Of that 4 million, 1.8 million are gainfully employed and 500,000 are on welfare. Saying Good-bye to Catholic Ireland meant saying hello again to the same wretched Capitalism that had driven my grandfather from his farm near Cork to Philadelphia over a century before.

The Maynooth Conference

The Maynooth conference sponsored by the Linacre Centre was more upscale than my talk. The Linacre Centre conference on bioethics at Maynooth had the air of Human Life International conferences of the kind I had attended 20 to 25 years ago. It was long on the arcane particulars of genetic engineering of various sorts but short on the cultural ligaments which held these techniques together in one explainable fabric of pathology. The Linacre Centre has fought a valiant rearguard action against the Culture of Death in England, which has one of the most advanced genetic engineering establishments in the world. England was heavily involved in *in vitro* fertilization when the rest of the world, including America, hardly knew what it was. The Linacre Centre brought out a brilliant little book on the consequences of this violation of nature, entitled *Who Am I?* The book tracked the plight of children who were fathered by donor insemination and grew up with the uncanny sense that things weren't as they seemed. This sense of biological insecurity is something that isn't supposed to exist in the brave new world of genetic technology (The only reaction the children got when they objected to growing up without a biological father was being told that they should be grateful to be alive.)

And yet here as elsewhere the Church is handicapped by its allegiance to a culture which despises everything the Church stands for. Missing from the talks, I thought, was any understanding of the deliberate instrumentalization of deviance which united all of the individual pathologies under discussion. In order to make my point during the question and answer period following talks on sexual ethics (by Alexander Pruss, Luke Gormally, and Dr. Philip Sutton), I described the collapse of the Black-Jewish alliance and the rise of the homosexual as the *avant garde* of revolution beginning with the Stonewall Riot of 1969. No one objected to my comments at the time, but a number of people complained privately about them afterwards.

It was a scenario depressingly similar to the handling of the priest abuse crisis. As soon as you get specific about the historical circumstances and dramatis personae involved in a particular crisis, someone attempts to shut down the discussion. I was reminded of the reaction of Bernard Cardinal Law to my article on Niels Rasmussen's death, which appeared in *Fidelity* in January 1988 (cf. E. Michael Jones, [Is Notre Dame Still Catholic?](#), Fidelity Press, 2009). Rasmussen, a Danish Dominican who was head of the liturgy

program at Notre Dame, was found shot to death in the basement of his house surrounded by whips and chains, homosexual pornography, and automatic weapons, one of which had killed him. After I presented him with a copy of the article, Cardinal Law asked, "What good does this serve?" Perhaps his eminence now knows what good the article served. Within a few short years, Cardinal Law would be driven from office as a result of not wanting to know the bad news about sexual corruption among the clergy.

The most famous example of the sexual engineering of the Catholic clergy is Carl Rogers' use of Sensitivity Training to destroy the Los Angeles branch of the Immaculate Heart Nuns. We broke that story 25 years ago when we published an article by William Coulson, Rogers' assistant, detailing what Rogers had done to the Nuns. If you're interested in the full story, it's told in my book [Libido Dominandi: Sexual Liberation and Political Control](#).

Four years before Carl Rogers began introducing sensitivity training to the Immaculate Heart nuns in Los Angeles, Abraham Maslow was doing similar work on another group of nuns at the other end of the country. On April 17, 1962 Maslow gave a lecture to a group of nuns at Sacred Heart College in Massachusetts. Afterward he noted in his diary, that his talk had been very "successful," but he found this fact troubling "They shouldn't applaud me," he continued, "they should attack. If they were fully aware of what I was doing, they would [attack]." And why should they have attacked him?

Maslow was aware that encounter groups were toxic for Catholics in general and especially toxic for Catholic religious. Anyone who promoted encounter groups among Catholics was promoting ipso facto their demise as Catholics, even if he did so in the name of liberation and with that as his intent. For the liberal Jew or Protestant, the nun was the textbook case of someone in need of "liberation" and in the context of Catholic religious life and the vows upon which it was based, liberation could only mean annihilation. On February 25, 1967, Maslow wrote in his diary, "Maybe morons need rules, dogmas, ceremonies, etc." He then made a note to order a book entitled *Life among the Lowbrows* for the Brandeis library. He may have ordered it because the author of that book noted in it that "feeble-minded clients behaved much better and felt better being Catholic and following all the rules." Since the nuns weren't feeble-minded, this meant that bringing "self-actualization" to the nuns meant destroying their commitment to their vows and the Catholic Church. Perhaps this is why Maslow felt they

shouldn't have applauded his talk in 1962. Maslow, who had spent time at the National Training Laboratories' headquarters in Bethel, Maine, where encounter groups, with the help of subsidies from the Office of Naval Research, had been created; he knew that they were funded as a form of psychological warfare, and he had an inkling of the effect they would have on nuns, but it was up to his colleague Carl Rogers to do the actual experiment.

"I guess what I'm trying to say here," Maslow wrote in his journal in 1965, the same year that Carl Rogers began circulating his paper on the psychology of small group encounter among the IHM nuns and around the same time that the nuns started to leave the convent, "is that these interpersonal therapeutic growth-fostering relationships of all kinds which rest on intimacy, on honesty, on self-disclosure, on becoming sensitively aware of one's self -- and thereby of responsibility for feeding back one's impression of others, etc. -- that these are profoundly revolutionary devices, in the strict sense of the word -- that is, of shifting the whole direction of a society in a more preferred direction. As a matter of fact, it might be revolutionary in another sense if something like this were done very widely. I think the whole culture would change within a decade and everything in it.

In an article which appeared in *Culture Wars* in 2004, Patrick Guinan, M.D. described the devastating effects that the systematic implementation of these revolutionary techniques would have on religious life in the United States. What we're talking about here is the wholesale abandonment of ascetical practice among the clergy, or as Guinan put it:

What changed between the first and second halves of the twentieth century were not the management policies on sex abuse and secrecy at all costs -- these remained a constant throughout -- nor do we have evidence to show that the personality features of seminarians or priests changed in any fundamental way that would account for the nature and the magnitude of the crisis -- in its early stages at least. . . . the core change over the course of the 20th century was one of purpose or allegiance -- leaving behind ascetical discipline, having disdain for religious tradition, and adopting the therapeutic mentality, a popular belief that fulfillment of the human person springs from emotional desire in a quest for self-definition, or self-actualization, without regard to an objective philosophical, religious or moral truth. Further, the therapeutic mentality views sin as a social concern and discourages loyalty to religious authority; it is profoundly anti-ascetical.

Allegiance to the therapeutic mentality has dislodged ascetical habits and manners, and it now holds sway over the attitudes of clergy, just as it strengthened its materialist grip on western societies for nearly a century. Mental health experts and educators, as the main purveyors of the therapeutic mentality, know little of the spiritual life and are ignorant of ascetical discipline. Nevertheless, in the name of science, and as the prime representatives of the educated elite, they advocated a liberalization of sexual standards before the sexual scandal in the Church, and then attempted to advise the bishops and to treat problem priests as the crisis took form. Bishops, who have oversight of the parish priests and seminaries, and who have been at the center of the crisis management, do not speak much, if at all, about ascetical discipline. Priests give few indications that they know or care about ascetical discipline. But most clergy seemed well versed in language of the therapeutic mentality. Predictably, when the storm surge in pagan sexuality began to overwhelm the natural defenses of the clergy in the 1950s and 1960s, those without the spiritual anchor of ascetical discipline were set adrift -- perpetrators as well as their managers. As the initial storm surge receded, a spawn of the therapeutic mentality remained in the tidal pools.

The man who introduced these ideas into the Church and therefore the man most responsible for the sexual corruption of the American clergy was the psychologist and former Maryknoll priest Eugene Kennedy. In 1972 Father Kennedy was commissioned by the United States Catholic bishops to do a survey of American priests. Kennedy was a disciple of Erik Erikson, aka, Erik Salomonsen, Erik Homburger, a Jewish psychiatrist who, like Wilhelm Reich, was deeply influenced by the writings of Sigmund Freud. Central to the thinking of both men was the idea that sexual repression was psychologically damaging, a theory totally at odds with the Catholic tradition of a celibate clergy.

In addition to Freud's theory of sexual repression, Kennedy also imported Erikson's theory of ego development, according to which each person went through eight developmental stages:

- 1) the first year of life, 2) through the second year, 3) from age three to six, 4) from age of six to puberty, 5) adolescence, 6) early adulthood, 7) young and middle adulthood, and 8) later adulthood. Each stage had

to be successfully worked through for normal development. Stage six required sexual intimacy and expression.

According to the teaching of the Catholic Church, "Chastity is an aspect of temperance which inclines a person to deliberately forego sexual relations for ascetical purposes." According to Freud and Erickson, any such renunciation in the name of religion, which both men considered a dangerous illusion, "would be abnormal and possibly pathologic."

When Kennedy's survey came out in book form as *The Catholic Priest in the United States: Psychological Investigations*, the results were a foregone conclusion, given the premises with which he began his study. Of the 271 priests surveyed, Kennedy found that only 19 (or 7 percent) could be termed psychologically "developed." The overwhelming majority of American priests were "not developed," because they had not engaged in sexual activity.

The standard against which the priests were judged was Erickson's development scale. Because the majority of priests were underdeveloped, they remained in Stage Six or the early adult stage, because in order to get beyond Stage Six, the priests would have to engage in "sexual intimacy."

Guinan claims that Kennedy's study contributed to the sexual abuse crisis by giving the impression that celibacy was nothing more than repression, and that repression was unhealthy:

If repression is portrayed as psychologically unhealthy, it can be argued that Kennedy's Psychological Investigations and its flawed psychology gave support and justification to beliefs that resulted in the sex abuse of minors. Erickson's insistence that sexual intimacy was essential to successfully traverse developmental stage six, justified sexual acting out in general, but it also justified sexual activity with predominantly male minors, who because of their proximity were the targets of abusive priests.

Guinan goes on to blame Kennedy for the current priest scandals:

When Psychological Investigations was published in 1972, it relied on Erickson's and Freud's materialist psychology, which posited unrestrained sexual behavior as inevitable and healthy. Seminary formation programs as well as individual priests accepted Kennedy

uncritically and in an effort to move beyond Stage Six and become normal through sexual intimacy began acting out sexually. Since priests, many of whom were homosexually inclined, had ready access to adolescent males, this vulnerable group of victims was disproportionately targeted. While some abusers were implicated in serial rapes many involved only isolated cases. Nonetheless most involved coercion and all were breaches of both the sixth and ninth commandments as well as the vow of chastity. The scandal, now involving hundreds of cases, has resulted in significant damage to efforts at evangelization in the United States, to say nothing of the staggering financial losses.

In 1976 the revolution that Reich had predicted as resulting from the sexualization of the clergy came out into the open. The inaugural event was a celebration of the bicentennial of America known as the Call to Action Conference. The revolution was led by the sexualized clergy. Call to Action was the Catholic equivalent of the tennis court oaths. The Revolution was now out in the open. The vector of revolutionary transmission was the Church's educational system.

Two of the participants at the Call to Action conference were Dr. & Mrs. John Krejci. In 1996 both Dr. & Mrs. Krejci were excommunicated by Bishop Fabian Bruskewitz, ordinary of the diocese for Lincoln, Nebraska, for belonging to an anti-Catholic organization, namely Call to Action. During the 1960s, Professor Krejci was Father Krejci, a priest who was working on his doctorate in theology and Mrs. Krejci was a nun by the name of Jean Gettelfinger. Mr. & Mrs. Krejci met at Notre Dame. Like many who attended that university, Father Krejci and Sister Gettelfinger got married, and when they did they left their respective religious orders.

The real problem lay with the clergy who felt no reason to leave because they were homosexual. Once the heterosexuals ran off and got married, the Church was left with a serious homosexual problem. Germain Grisez says most "abuse" consists in seduction by homosexual priests:

The bishops and those who speak for them should acknowledge honestly that most clerical sex crimes that have come to light have been seductions of adolescents and young men by homosexual priests. Because Jesus entrusts bishops to oversee the pastoral care of souls, those bishops who failed to do all that they could and should have done

to prevent or limit a priest's crimes ought to ponder very carefully the moral and spiritual nature and gravity of their own omissions and actions. Having done that, those bishops should reexamine their consciences, repent any sins they previously overlooked, and begin to do what they can and should do by way of restitution.

The Church was then denied the ability to solve its homosexual problem because the dominant culture that was leveling the accusations refused to admit that homosexuality was a problem at all, much less the problem that was tearing the Church apart. The issue is complicated by the hypocrisy and double standards of the institutions that were acting as judge, jury and executioner in the sex abuse scandals. Throughout the period in question, the media continued making contradictory demands on the Church. On the one hand, the media, especially during the '70s, were claiming that we should all act on our sexual impulses whether they are congruent with the moral law or not. Thirty years later, the same institutions were claiming that certain people should be punished for doing what they were told to do.

On the one hand, the media are claiming that there is nothing wrong with homosexuality, ignoring the fact that 80 percent of the offenses which have been actually proven involve homosexual behavior between clergy and victims over the age of puberty. Because the campaign against the Church coincided in time with a campaign by the same group of people to legitimize homosexuality, the Church was denied any effective way of defending itself against the sexual fifth column which had established itself in the Church in the wake of the implementation of Vatican II. Professor Schockenhoff claims that "Dialogue with the Jews" is a non-negotiable part of Church teaching now, but during the sex abuse crisis, the Church's "elder brothers" sided with the homosexual fifth column which was the source of the Church's woes. During the debate leading to the passage of the federal health care bill, all of the major Jewish organizations signed a friend of the court brief demanding that the Obama administration allow the Catholic Church no exemptions of conscience when it comes to hiring homosexuals. Actions speak louder than words. In spite of all the dialogue which had been promoted in the wake of Vatican II, there was no collaboration in the area of religious freedom and freedom of conscience when it came to the health bill and the concerns it raised for Catholics. While many may have had no thought beyond promoting the liberal agenda, the net result of their intervention was to create a homosexual fifth column within the Catholic Church, one which, because

of the nature of its sexual activities, can be used to create a whole new series of lawsuits. With Elder Brothers like this, who needs enemies?

When it came to media concern about sex scandals in the Church, it was becoming increasingly difficult to separate the arsonists from the fire department. As the late Tom Herron wrote in *Culture Wars*:

Father Shanley of Boston used to be the toast of the award winning *Boston Globe* back in the early '70s when he was a long-haired street priest who worked with young people, spoke against Catholic moral teachings and was a known early founder of NAMBLA (North American Man-Boy Love Association.) Thirty years later, the same newspaper, *The Boston Globe*, "was instrumental in bringing him back from retirement in California to face trial and imprisonment in Massachusetts."

GIFT and *Dignitas Personae* #12

One of the most powerful presentations at the Linacre Conference was given by a Jesuit by the name of Kevin Flannery. Twenty-five years ago, he and Paul Mankowski, another Jesuit speaker at the conference, showed up at my house as newly ordained priests. At the time I took it as a sign of hope for a bright future in the Church that the Jesuits would ordain dedicated men like this. What I should have told these bright young men back then is "if you wish to serve the Lord, prepare for suffering." Paul Mankowski, who would go on to receive a degree in Semitic philology at Harvard while serving as boxing coach there, would spend the next 25 years circling the ring with his Jesuit superiors, fending them off with theological jabs like "I accept the authority of my Jesuit superiors insofar as it is congruent with the teaching of the Catholic Church." Father Mankowski spent years teaching at the Biblicum, but as part of the ongoing battle over his allegiance to the Jesuits and his final vows he was summarily dismissed and sent to teach freshman Latin at a ghetto high school in Chicago.

Father Flannery fared better at the Gregorian University in Rome, where he is now a dean, but that only enabled him to become involved in abstruse bioethical doctrinal battles at the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. His talk was about one of those battles. Paragraph #12 of *Dignitas Personae*, the most recent document on fertility technology issued by the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith, has been taken to imply that procedures like GIFT (or Gamete Intrafallopian Transfer) are morally acceptable. Father Flannery feels that they are not because they "involve a third active factor" which violates the integrity of the sexual act. Father Flannery used the rest of his talk to explain how this contradiction arose and how he as a faithful Catholic had to deal with it:

How has the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith gotten into this tangle of setting out conditions for morally acceptable procedures and then saying that procedures that cannot meet those conditions are acceptable? In my opinion, what has happened is that, when the Church first began to consider these issues and her thinking was more clear than it is now, she set out sound principles for their analysis. She has also always been aware of couples -- both within the Church and without -- who experience difficulties in conceiving and who desperately want children: a very natural and, therefore, good desire in itself. So, while continuing to propound the sound

principles at the core of the Church's teaching, the Congregation has seized upon whatever opportunity the language with which those principles are formulated affords -- or appears to afford -- in order to approve procedures that might allow couples to have children.

Father Flannery bolstered his case by citing one document after another which showed that "In this regard, the teaching of the magisterium is already explicit" [*"Ad rem quod attinet, magisterii doctrina iam explicata est"*]. He then attempts to explain how a doctrine that is "already explicit" could undergo corruption by giving a close analysis of Pius XII's 1949 address to midwives:

He first says that artificial fertilization outside of marriage is to be condemned as immoral and that the child resulting from such a procedure would be illegitimate. (Repeatedly in his addresses regarding this issue Pius XII expresses concern for the upbringing of progeny and so also for their legitimacy.) He then says that artificial fertilization "within marriage, but effected by the active factor of a third party, is equally immoral and, as such, to be condemned out of hand." The problem with such a procedure, he says, is that, "between the legitimate husband and the child, fruit of the active factor of a third party (even were the husband consenting), there exists no connection of origin: no moral and juridical connection of conjugal procreation." In effect, the problem is that the husband in this marriage has not generated the child who results from the procedure, for generation has been effected by the third party. It is clear that the problem here for Pius XII is not illegitimacy, for he speaks of the husband as legitimate; the problem is rather, who has generated the child: who is the initiator, the agent, whose action results in the generation of a child?

How then did the corruption of doctrine come about?

The small word *iam* inserted into the paraphrase makes all the difference. Where Pius XII speaks simply of "the natural act performed in a normal manner" [*"l'acte naturel normalement accompli"*], the paraphrase, imposing a meaning upon the participle "*accompli*" it can hardly bear, speaks of an act that has been normally performed in the past. The Supreme Pontiff is suddenly not condemning all types of fertilization but approving one type -- a type in which clearly the act of generation is not the conjugal act but an act performed by technicians in

a lab.

Father Flannery, as a result, finds himself in a dilemma.

This all places individuals (such as myself) who believe that they owe to the teachings of the magisterium *religiosum voluntatis et intellectus obsequium* in something of a dilemma. One welcome way out of the dilemma would be to discover that we (I) am simply wrong: there is something wrong with the present analysis and there is nothing contradictory about the teaching of DP§12 (and the related teaching in *Donum vitae*).

But let us say that I am not wrong. It is logically impossible to give obsequium (of any sort) to a set of ideas that are contradictory and recognized as such: obsequium involves at the very least acknowledgement that a set of ideas could be true, but a contradiction cannot be true.

The way out of this dilemma is not to be found by leaving the Church because:

. . . finding such a contradiction does not leave obedient sons and daughters of the Church completely in the lurch, for the teaching office of the Church is exercised within a tradition of moral reflection inspired by the Holy Spirit. An incoherent paragraph or two in a magisterial document -- such as are inevitable when human beings are writing the documents -- do not cancel out the tradition, but quite the converse: the offending paragraphs (if they truly are such) ought to be judged from the perspective of the tradition. This is the proper attitude to adopt toward *Dignitas personae* §12, derived as it is from *Donum vitae*, which states that "in this regard" -- that is, in regard to homologous artificial fertilization -- "the teaching of the magisterium is already explicit."

New Light

Father Flannery's struggle throws a new light on the complaints of Bishop Williamson. To begin with, unlike Bishop Williamson, who complains about ambiguous statements in council documents, Father Flannery believes he has come across an actual contradiction of Church teaching. The only way the contradiction in *Dignitatis Humanae* 12 is going to be resolved is the way the Church has resolved issues in the past, which is to say, by going over the issue again and reconstruing it in the light of tradition. *Non datur tertius*. There is no other way. To pretend there is is to be radically anti-traditional.

This is precisely what the SSPX is refusing to do by refusing to affirm their acceptance of the documents of Vatican II as interpreted in the light of tradition. All that Bishop Williamson and the SSPX have to do to be readmitted to the Church is affirm the statement, "I accept the documents of Vatican II in the light of tradition." He does not have to affirm that x number of Jews died in the holocaust. He does not have to affirm Professor Schockenhoff's interpretation of Vatican II or his endorsement of "*Gespraech mit dem Judentum*."

When Bishop Williamson tells me this affirmation of Vatican II in the light of tradition is the condition which Rome has set for readmission to the Church, I blurt out, "It's that simple?"

"It's not that simple," Williams replies.

"Yes, it is." I feel like saying, but do not.

"If we sign this document, we are affirming the validity of Vatican II which means that we are affirming the very thing which is destroying the Church."

The statement is patently preposterous, but I bite my tongue and attempt to steer the conversation in another direction.

"Has the Church failed in its mission?" I ask.

"No," Bishop Williamson replies.

"Then there's no reason to separate from the Church."

"We haven't separated from the Church.."

"Then what are the negotiations about then?"

Before long it becomes apparent that they are about bringing Rome around to the point of view of the SSPX. As another sign that the discussions are doomed to go nowhere, Bishop Williamson told me that an SSPX priest is

planning to use their meeting with the *Ecclesia Dei* commission in the Spring of 2011 as an opportunity to explain to Rome the errors in *Dignitatis Humanae*. By now it is clear that this dialogue became Mission Impossible for a number of reasons. First of all, by concentrating on doctrinal issues in general and Vatican II in particular, it avoided the main issue that needed to be resolved, namely, schism, which has nothing to do with doctrine. Secondly, there are large segments of the hierarchy which confuse the documents of Vatican II with the spirit of Vatican II and as a result want to make readmission to the Church contingent on a particular theological interpretation of council documents rather than an affirmation of the documents themselves "in the light of tradition." Bishop Williamson seems determined to conflate Rome with that group of people, thereby granting an unearned victory to the George Weigels and Professor Schockenhoffs, and allowing them by default to impose a neocon litmus test on the rest of the Church.

As if to answer my question about the purpose of the negotiations, Bishop Williamson gets up to look for a large piece of paper. I volunteer a page from my notebook, but it's not large enough to convey the sweep of his idea, which is that throughout history movements have broken off from the Church, as did the Arians, the Protestants, the revolutionaries in France, but through it all the Church has maintained its commitment to tradition and the scriptures. This sounds like an argument against the SSPX position to me, but that's only because I see the Church and the SSPX as two separate entities. For Bishop Williamson, they are one and the same thing. The frustrating thing about conversation with him lies in his inability to acknowledge the premises upon which his argument is based. So when I ask if the SSPX is the Church, he immediately says no.

Back and Forth

Our conversation goes back and forth over church history. His excellency brings up the Inquisition, intimating that if it were re-established, he would rejoin the Church. I point out that there was a time when there was no Inquisition, but there has never been a time since when Christ walked the earth that there has been no Church. He brings up doctrine, but the same applies here. There was a time when no Christian could say for certain that Christ was true God and true man, because the formula hadn't been articulated, but there was never a time when there was no Church. I then bring up the Church's position on usury, which is still awaiting its definitive explication.

By now it's time for lunch and the theological discussion lurches to an unresolved end. After lunch, his excellency takes a nap and I prepare my talk by walking around the gravel track in their lower garden, making mental notes about the talk which gradually get supplanted with thoughts about what I would do if it were my garden. When Father Morgan, the English SSPX superior, appears to give the timetable for the rest of the afternoon, I tell him that the middle of the garden would be the ideal place for a fountain.

"My mother said the same thing," he replied.

In the end the talk went well, there was a lively question and answer period afterward, but no one in attendance address the talk's conclusion, which I reproduce here in its entirety:

Yes, the Church was derelict in not preaching the gospel, especially on sexual matters. Yes, the Church chose therapy over the penal sanctions required by canon law. Yes, the Church is being punished for following the advice of the psychologists. Yes, the current scandals are being orchestrated by the Church's traditional enemies, Protestants and Jews in order to destroy traditional cultures and make the world safe for Capitalism and the universal rule of Mammon. But what is the proper response?

Let's answer that question by explaining what is not the proper response. In a recent interview, Bishop Fellay talked about the current state of the Society of St. Pius X. After throwing Bishop Williamson under the bus, Bishop Fellay went on to say that "the Church has cancer" and that "we do not want to embrace the Church because we might contract cancer."

There are a number of things one might say about such a statement. First of all, cancer is not contagious. Secondly, this image -- the Church has cancer -- can be found nowhere in the tradition of the Church, not in the Gospels, not in the Acts of the Apostles, not in the Epistles and not in the writing of the Church Fathers. The reason is simple enough: it does not and cannot correspond to reality.

If the cancer image is faulty, anti-traditional and unscriptural, what image does correspond to the situation of the Church in our time? The answer is the story in Mark 4:35-41, the story of Jesus calming the storm. We are told that:

It began to blow a gale, and the waves were breaking into the boat so that it was almost swamped. But [Jesus] was in the stern, his head on the cushion, asleep. They woke him and said to him, "Master, do you not care? We are going down!" And he woke up and rebuked the wind and said to the sea, "Quiet now! Be calm!" And the wind dropped and all was calm again. Then he said to them, "Why are you so frightened? How is it that you have no faith?" They were filled with awe and said to one another, "Who can this be? Even the wind and the sea obey him."

All of the Church Fathers are unanimous in saying that the boat is the Church and that the boat is going to be tossed about by storms, which is to say, campaigns orchestrated to destroy the Church.

St. Hilary of Poitiers writes that Christ "bids us to be within the Church, and to be in peril until such time as returning in His splendor He shall give salvation to all the people ... Meanwhile the disciples are tossed by the wind and the waves; struggling against all the storms of this world, raised by the opposition of the unclean spirit."

St. Augustine tells us to "Think of the boat as the Church, and the stormy sea as this world. . . . For when any of a wicked will and of great power, proclaims a persecution against the Church, then it is that a mighty wave rises against the boat of Christ." We are to remain in that storm-tossed boat until, "when the night is nearly ended, He shall come, in the end of the world, when the night of iniquity is past, to judge the quick and the dead."

When Christ finally does come, according to St. Hilary, he will

find His Church wearied, and tossed by the spirit of the Anti-Christ, and by the troubles of this world. And because by long experience of Anti-Christ they will be troubled at every novelty of trial, they shall

have fear even at the approach of the Lord, suspecting deceitful appearances. But the good Lord banishes their fear saying, It is I; and by proof of His presence takes away their dread of impending shipwreck.

From the perspective of the faithful who have to endure these storms, it always seems as if Jesus is asleep, which is to say, unconcerned with their plight. This is, of course, not the case. God is always with his Church, even when it appears that he is not. Jumping ship means instant death. Because God can calm any storm, the real issue is not the magnitude of the storm, but rather as Jesus points out, the magnitude of our faith.

The Only Thing

As things stand now, the only thing holding back the reconciliation of the SSPX and the Church is Bishop Williamson's (and three other SSPX bishops') signature on a document that he himself admits Archbishop Lefebvre would have signed. Four days after I gave my talk at SSPX headquarters in Wimbledon, it was clear that my overture to Bishop Williamson had failed. On June 28, 2010, his excellency wrote on his blog that:

Archbishop Lefebvre chose a third way, in between the two extremes of either Truth or Authority. His way, in which he has been followed by that SSPX, was to cling to Catholic Truth, but with no disrespect towards Church Authority, nor any blanket disbelief in the status of its officials. It is a balance certainly not always easy to keep, but it has borne Catholic fruit all over the world, and it has sustained a faithful remnant of Catholics with true doctrine and the true sacraments for the 40 years we have so far spent in the Conciliar desert (1970-2010). In that desert we Catholic sheep may have to be scattered for a while yet, as long as the Shepherd in Rome is struck (Zech. XIII, 7, quoted by Our Lord in the Garden of Gethsemane - Mt. XXVI, 31). In this Gethsemane of the Church, we do need compassion on our fellow sheep. . . . But that no way means that the third way as traced out by Archbishop Lefebvre has ceased to be the right way.

Non datur tertius. When it comes to the Church there is no third way. Bishop Williamson affirms here all of the propositions -- the Church has failed in its mission, the SSPX is the Church -- that he denied in our conversation. The only thing that remains the same is his adamant refusal to restore communion, not even on terms that Archbishop Lefebvre would have accepted. In his history of the Hussite rebellion in Bohemia, Aeneas Silvio Piccolomini, who took the name Pius II when he became pope, referred to Jan Zizka, the one-eyed military genius who lost both eyes leading the invincible Hussite armies, as "the blind leader of a blind people." The phrase kept popping into my mind during the course of our interview, but especially when Bishop Williamson said that the society was going to break apart, for it seems as if he is determined to stick by an organization that is doomed to self-destruct anyway.

As a gesture of friendship, I gave Bishop Williamson a copy of [The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit and its Impact on World History](#). On the first page of the book, I wrote a dedication "To Bishop Williamson," and then added "*Ut unum sint*." He laughed when he read it, and everyone else at the table laughed when I said that an artifact like this was destined to end up in the holocaust museum in Washington. What occurred to me later is that the SSPX is more like the Jews than either of us were willing to admit at the time. Like the Jews, the time of their visitation has arrived and the SSPX is too blind to see it. They were unable to sign a document that Archbishop Lefebvre could have signed without hesitation, and in failing to sign it they were unable to see that they were doing more to enhance the modernist agenda they ostensibly oppose than would have been the case if they had accepted their rightful position as docile members of the Church.

Ultimately, the inscription was no laughing matter. Unity in the Church is not some optional feature, like white wall tires on a car. It goes to the very heart of Christ's conception of the church and it goes to the very heart as well of the woes that have been inflicted on the world since the cataclysmic violation of that unity which followed from the events of 1517. That situation was not improved by the events of 1988.

Bishop Williamson is 69 years old. That is one year short of the Biblical allotment of years granted to men. If the society is going to break up anyway, I argued, then let it be through his unilateral signing of the agreement with Rome. At this suggestion, he simply throws up his hands, as if to say the suggestion is too preposterous for words. The suggestion is far from preposterous. In fact, as live options go, it's the only option he has left.

Biographical Note

E. Michael Jones, editor of [Culture Wars](#) magazine, is the author of more than fifteen books, several of which are available in e-editions, including:
[Travels with Harley in Search of America: Motorcycles, War, Deracination,](#)
[Consumer Identity](#)
[Jewish Nazis](#)
[Requiem for a Whale Rider](#)